

4244
DEFENSE

Of a Late

4. 2.

PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED,

A Preservative, &c.

IN ANSWER to an

ABUSIVE LETTER

OF

Mr. JOSEPH HALLET, Jun.

By JOHN ENTY.

LONDON

Printed, for AARON TOZER, Jun. at the Bible
in the High Street, Exon. M, DCC, XXX.

516



*A DEFENSE of a late Pamphlet, entitled,
A Preservative, &c.*

I AM sorry I shou'd have Occasion to trouble the World with any Vindication of my self, or any thing that I said in a late Pamphlet, entitled, *A Preservative, &c.* I am very sensible that none can be much the wiser for any thing Mr. *Hallet* hath said; and I cou'd propose to do but very little Service, shou'd I take the Method that he hath, or strictly confine my self to consider what he offers in Answer to what he calls (in his complaisant Way) my *Slandrous Pamphlet*: For instead of defending his *Notes* and *Discourses* from what I thought, and still think, I had justly advanced against them, he says so little to the Purpose in their Vindication, that, in effect, he gives them up as Indefensible, or hath very unkindly left them to shift for themselves. When therefore Mr. *H---* hath so very little to say in Defense of himself and Principles, and instead of a fair Answer, hath contented himself with the easier Task of *Raillery* and *Outragiousness*, I might have excused my self from engaging any farther with such a *Disputant*, and left his *little Performance* to be censur'd and confuted by it self: But then, as he is pleased to represent it as an *Answer*, so I did not know but the Observation of a Learned Writer (*viz* That great Impositions do often arise from Names and Words) might take place here; and this must be in part my Apology for this my Reply.

As to Mr. *H---*'s Letter it self, I am assured by several of my *Learned* and *Ingenious Friends*, that they never saw any thing so full of *Bitterness*, *Raillery*, *Rudeness*, &c. in all their Lives. And I confess, I can't but be much concern'd, that Mr. *H---* or any other Person should fall into a Way of writing so entirely unbecoming a *Scholar*, or a *Christian*. Such a Conduct may very probably be pleasing to the Enemies of Religion, and may perhaps gratify a few of Mr. *H---*'s more *warm Friends*; but then, I don't see how it can fail to involve the Person in a great deal of Guilt, that gives himself such *Airs* and *Liberties*. And then besides, the Question between Mr. *H---* and Me, is not, Who hath most Learning, and the best Sense; but whose Notions are most agreeable to Scripture, and best adapted to answer the Great Designs of Religion. And therefore it wou'd have been more to the Purpose, and, I think, to his Honour, to answer what I have said, and to have set before

the World the ill Tendency of any Notions I have advanced, than to tell the World, without any seeming Regard to *Decency*, or *Good Manners*, not to say *Truth*, that I have been guilty of Lying, Forgery, Falsification, Impertinence, Envy, and what not. When *Raillery* is thus forced to supply the Want of *Reasoning*, it very often shews the *Badness* of the Cause, or the *Weakness* of the *Abettor*; but yet may put a Person under some *Disadvantages* that dares not repay his Adversary in the same Coin.

I assure Mr. H---t, that I esteem it an Honour to be reviled, when I think it to be for *Christ's Sake*, and know it to be *Causeless*; and am satisfy'd, it can affect my Reputation the less, when some Men revile me: But I wish however, for his own sake, that he had writ with *less Passion*, and a stricter Regard to *Truth* and *Conscience*. I have the Satisfaction (if it be any) to be treated by Mr. H---t as others have. Not to mention here Bp. *Pearson*, Dr. *Tower-son*, Mr. *Johnson*, and several others. How very near a-kin is his Treatment of Dr. *Waterland* (as fair and learned a Writer as this Age hath produced) to his Treatment of me, I mean, if he be (as is generally said and believed) the Author of a Pamphlet, entitled, *The Unity of God, &c.* and the Reply to Dr. *Waterland's* Remarks upon it? For here, he represents him, " as seeking to raise the Passions of his Readers, and to gain their Assent by the low and unworthy Methods of Positiveness, Dictating, Contempt, and Misrepresentation; he chargeth him with Impertinence, with Trifling, with Dishonesty, with Absurdity, with talking inconsistently with the Truth and Himself, with a scandalous begging the Question, with Pride, and tells us, that he can't but heartily pity a Man who makes no Conscience of such presumptuous Misrepresentations of an Adversary to prejudice the Reader against him. * " How worthy of a *Scholar* is such *fine Rhetorick*? And how vain wou'd it be in me, to expect that I shou'd meet with fairer Quarter, when so Great a Man as Dr. *Waterland* cou'd not escape such virulent Censures? Such Censures as I have fallen under, when I know them to be groundless, sit much easier upon me, than I believe Mr. H---t thinks; and, I bless God, I can readily forgive the Person from whom they come: But yet however, as Things are circumstantiated, I reckon it as a piece of *Justice* that I owe to *Truth* and my own *Character*, to consider a little what Mr. H---t hath said.

* Reply to Dr. *Waterland's* Remarks, and Pamphlet, entitled, *The Unity, &c.* p. 1, 10, 15, 16, 20, 26, 30, 46, &c.

Mr. H---t begins his *Warm Performance* with telling the World, " That he had neither Leisure nor Inclination to " take Notice of every particular Passage in my *Preservative*, " and that the World is not much concern'd in the Dispute " I have rais'd." But 'tis not so very difficult to guess why so little is taken Notice of: For some things, I am apt to believe, that are very much against Mr. H---t's Notions, won't admit of an Answer; and if he had attempted to answer others, he must have been obliged to speak more plainly than I apprehend he is willing to do; lest some other of his Notions, as well as those that I have oppos'd, shou'd (as he may think things stand at present) appear too shocking to some, that he may vainly flatter himself he hath an Interest in. As to the World's having no Concern in the Dispute which he says I have rais'd, I know of none that hath been rais'd by me. And really, I take so little Pleasure in *Controversy*, that if Mr. H---t and his Friends had been quiet, and made no Attempts to alter our *Faith* and *Worship*, there wou'd, I believe, have been no Disputes in these Parts; and for my self, I can be pretty sure, I shou'd have engaged in none: But 'twou'd argue too shameful an Unconcernedness about Religion, if no one shou'd take Notice of those many Assaults that have been made upon it. In the present Case, every one knows Mr. H---t gave the Occasion, and therefore may be justly esteem'd the Aggressor; for he laid a great many things before the World, that many, as well as I, thought had no Foundation in Scripture, and that had a very odd and ill Tendency. If therefore Mr. H---t thought these things to be true and useful, and therefore published them; I cou'd not but think them to be false, and of a dangerous Tendency, and therefore oppos'd them: So that his Business now is either to *Vindicate* or *Retract* them. And, whatever Mr. H---t may think, the World must be nearly concern'd, when the *Faith* they profess is boldly deny'd; when the *Saviour* and *God* whom they worship hath his *Perfections* and *Glory* ravish'd from him; when that *Law of Liberty* by which they must be judged, is represented as antiquated and done away; and when the *Heaven* they expect thro' a Saviour, as the Consequence of their Obedience to these Laws, is turn'd into an *Earthly Paradise*, &c. If the World is not concern'd in these things, they are not concern'd in Religion; and if this indeed be the Case, it wou'd, I own, be as foolish in any to oppose Mr. H---t, as it wou'd be in him to write about that in which the World hath no Concern: But tho' things are come to a very *melancholy pass*, I wou'd hope, the Generality do still think, as the Author of the *Unity*, &c.

himself

himself once did, when there was a fairer Prospect of gaining Profelytes, *viz.* That the Controversies that have been on foot are of no small Importance to every Christian*. And certainly they must still be so, or else a very great Part of *revealed Religion*, wou'd (as the *Deist* suggests concerning the whole) be a useless thing.

Mr. *H---t* is at liberty to charge me with Envy, and with being malicious, as *p. 1.* but whatever he suggests, 'twas never my Design to represent him to the World as a bad Man; but to shew, that some of his Notions have a very bad Tendency. And he hath said so little in their Vindication, that I can't help it, that I am still of the same Opinion. If I say, he falls foul upon some Parts of *Revealed Religion*, 'tis what I have endeavour'd to prove, and Mr. *H---t* hath not answer'd. If I say, that his Notions about a future State sap the Foundations of a great Part of Natural Religion, &c. the ingenious Mr. *Grove* (a Person of acknowledg'd Candour) in Answer to Mr. *H---t*'s twelfth Chapter of Discourses and Observations, says more, *viz.* "That the Doctrine of No Evidence
" for a future State of Rewards and Punishments, immediately overthrows *all Natural Religion*; and that if we
" are under a Necessity of giving up all the *Moral Evidence*
" for a Life to come, which hath been always esteem'd so
" convincing, I fear there are many other things must follow
" after, and that we shall find it difficult to stop short of a
" State of *Universal Scepticism* in Religion †." Which I am sure must prepare Men for *all ill Practices*; and therefore Mr. *H---t* might have spar'd his *little Flurt* upon *Orthodoxy*, which wou'd have deserv'd no Notice, if it had not been attended with what some do and will think to be *Profaneness*; for what can it be better, when Scripture-Phrase is used in such a *ludicrous Way*? As to *Orthodoxy* it self, or what Mr. *H---t* ridicules as such, I assure him I glory in it.

'Twas not my desire, that any of my *Hearers* shou'd believe, that Mr. *H---t* was a wicked Man; but I wou'd hope, they all believe, that his Notions are very far from having a good Tendency: But if I am too charitable as to any of them, (as I wou'd fain flatter myself I am not) Mr. *H---t* hath furnish'd me with one reason for opposing his Notions, which I think to be very dangerous, and that is, that my People (of whom I expect to give an Account) mayn't receive any farther Prejudice by them. Whatever any of my People may think of Mr. *H---t*, I desire they may think no better or worse of him than he deserves: But this however I

* *Unity, &c. p. 1.*
Thoughts, &c. p. 101. 9.

† Mr. *Grove's* Answer to Mr. *H---t*, entitled, *Some*

am sure of (let his Goodness be what it will) that none who are not strongly prejudiced in his Favour, can have any great Idea of it from his way of Writing. As to myself, I shall never desire, that my *Orthodoxy* shou'd cover one of my Sins; and as to Mr. H---t, I wish, (tho' in the present Case I don't need it for myself) that his *Charity* (with the want of which others that dare not countenance his Errors have been so often upbraided) was sufficient to *cover one Sin*: But such a *Charity*, 'tis plain, hath no place in his little Performance, which is stuffed with all the Signs of *Rage*, and a *Persecuting Spirit*. And therefore, I hope, that neither he, nor any of his Temper, will any more complain of *Uncharitableness*, or *Persecution*. I am very sure he hath discover'd the true Temper of his *old Brethren* the *Arians*; and how much farther he wou'd go, if he had Power to punish, as well as Liberty to write, I can't say: But I hope, he'll give me leave to mind him of one of his own Notions, and to advise him (that however angry he may be with me) not to be so angry with all, that by way of *Sneer* he may call *Orthodox*, because 'tis well known, that many of those are vastly his *Superiors*.

As to my not being a perfect Judge of Mr. H---t's first Discourse, with which I am upbraided, *p. 4.* 'tis what I believe he knows nothing of, and therefore shou'd not have made the mean Reflexion; and if it was true what he insinuates (as strictly speaking it is not) he shou'd yet have been tender upon this Head; because I make no such vain Ostentation of my Knowledge of the *Hebrew* or any other Language, as he doth about his understanding *Syriac* and *German Catechisms*, when yet I am told, he does not know the Letters of the former, and, I believe, knows nothing of the latter.

'Tis odd in Mr. H---t to say, *p. 4.* in Vindication of what I think I very justly called his *poor Discourse* about Anger, that, Anger is constantly defined an Inclination to punish; for 'tis certain, that many *Moralists* and *Divines* do define it otherwise. To mention only two, *Eustachius* defines it, a Passion of the Soul occasioned by some present Evil which is to be repelled with some Difficulty*. Mr. *Baxter* calls it the rising up of the Heart in passionate Displeasure against an apprehended Evil which wou'd cross or hinder us of some desir'd Good†. And this he says is a Passion that the great “ Author of Nature hath planted in the Souls of *all*; and as “ he farther says, is given us by God for Good, to stir us up “ to a vigorous Resistance of these things which within us,

* *Eustach. Ethicæ*, p. 101. † *Baxter's Christian Directory*, P. I. p. 285.

“ or without us, do oppose his Glory, or our Salvation, or our
 “ own, or our Neighbour’s real Good.” And certain it is, that
 the Poor ought to consult their Good as well as the Rich, and
 to arm against every thing that wou’d obstruct it. I allow to
 Mr. *H---t*, that the *Stoics* do very commonly define Anger
 pretty much as he does; but then, they don’t say as Mr. *H---t*
 does, nor yet doth Mr. *Locke*, *Curcellæus*, *Des Cartes*, &c.
 That ’tis a Desire of taking present Revenge with our own
 Hands; this is many times out of the Power of the Law
 and Mean, and therefore, says *Seneca**, “ Anger is the De-
 “ fire, not the Power, and Faculty of Revenge, neither is
 “ any Man, says he, so low, but that the greatest may perad-
 “ venture lie at his Mercy.” But if they never should,
 must the Poor and Mean be always passive and indolent un-
 der the Injuries that they receive? No, God doth not require
 it, they have certainly a Right to resent them, and may in-
 nocently appeal to the Magistrate for Redress. Thus Ser-
 vants, Children, and other Inferiors are encouraged to do,
 which yet they might not, if it was a Sin to resent Injuries
 when done by Superiors. I take Anger to be what the rest
 of Mankind do; and I have only Mr. *H---t*’s Word, that
 I mistake our Saviour, and the Apostle. ’Tis very plain, I
 think, that I did not. So that Mr. *H---t*’s Discourse about
 Anger appears still very poor to me, notwithstanding any
 thing he hath said in its Vindication; and ’tis very little to
 Mr. *H---t*’s Purpose, that his learned and worthy Friend
 hath observed to him, that *Lactantius* hath the same Thought
 about Anger. ’Tis well known to Mr. *H---t*’s learned and
 worthy Friend (if he hath read *Lactantius* over) whatever it
 be to him, that *Lactantius* hath a great many odd Fancies
 about the *Millennium*, *Christ’s Personal Reign on Earth*,
 &c. as well as this about Anger. Mr. *H---t*’s Discourse
 may be a very poor one, and yet others may think as he
 does, I never thought he was the only Person that talk’d
 poorly.

Mr. *H---t* says, *p. 5.* that what I say on his first
 Note is directly false in fact. This, I think, is much too
 rough; for no one cou’d reasonably understand more by
 any thing I said, than that what was valuable and material
 in Mr. *H---t*’s Remark on 2 *Kings* xxiv. 13. viz. (that it
 cou’d not be well render’d in our Translation, he cut in
 pieces all the Vessels of Gold, because these Vessels of Gold
 were still in being, and fit to be used as Drinking-Vessels)
 was observ’d before by Mr. *Pool* in his *Synopsis*, and the 5th

* Sir Roger L’Estrange’s *Seneca’s Morals*, p. 348.

of *Daniel* 2, 3. referr'd to. I know nothing else material in the Remark but this, and therefore 'twas vain in Mr. *H---t* to take the Honour of this Observation to himself, and very just in me to observe it, and say, that it seems to be little more than a Translation of what Mr. *Pool* says, to whom I might have added others. I can't see, that Mr. *H---t* hath any thing to the Purpose upon this Text that Mr. *Pool* and others have not; and if Mr. *H---t* had render'd the Word *Truncavit*, in Mr. *Pool* as it is commonly render'd, and as he himself hath render'd it in his *English Annotations*, cut off from, and not maimed, he cou'd not with any Modesty have charg'd me with what is directly false in Fact, and tell the World, that after such a Falshood, the Reader will less wonder at others he shall meet with. I leave the *scurvy Trick* (as Archbishop *Tilloson* calls it) of lying for what they take to be the Truth, to others, whose Cause may need it. Mr. *H---t* knows he hath been noted for *slandering lustily*: But as to myself, I hope, I need not be in much pain about what will stick. Only I would beg leave to put Mr. *H---t* in mind, that this is but a *mobbish way* of answering Books, and will never be thought by the Calm or Impartial to throw any Lustre upon his own Character.

Mr. *H---t* hath said nothing, p. 6. to shew, that his second Note was not very usefess. If Mr. *H---t* don't understand the Meaning of the Word *Representatives*, I can't help it, others do. If there was any thing amiss in my way of Reasoning, 'twas the Business of a fair Adversary to shew it. But 'tis too much the way of some, when they have nothing else to say, to discover their ill-nature in some little piece of *Banter*, or *Calumny*, and this must serve to supply the Place of what is better.

I thought I had said enough in the Preface to my *Preservative*, to shew, that the 51st Psalm cou'd have no Reference to the time of the *Jews* Restauration so many hundreds of Years after the Death of *Christ*, and that, what is said there, had its Accomplishment in the Days of *Solomon*. Mr. *H---t* says now, p. 6. "That when the *Jews* are restor'd to their own Land, they shall first restore their old "Worship, before they are converted to Christianity, and "when they are Christians lay it aside:" And says farther, "That I can't understand the last Chapter of *Ezekiel* without "supposing it." But if I cou'd not understand them without supposing such an absurd and groundless thing, I should much rather acknowledge my Ignorance, as others have done, than advance what Mr. *H---t* hath now, and in his

Notes, p. 3. viz. That at the Restauration of the *Jews*, God will be pleased with Sacrifices, and delight in Burnt-offerings: For how can God be pleased with what he himself hath abolished, and never designed should be in use again after the Death of the Messiah? Can it be pleasing to God, that the *Jews* shou'd be restor'd to their old Worship? Or can it be thought, that ever he shou'd suffer it to be so? If he shou'd, I shou'd for ever despair of their being converted to Christianity, when they had such an *Argument* against *Christ*, and *Christianity*, as this wou'd be. All that I understand by *Ezekiel's* last Chapters (if there be any Reference in them to Gospel-Times) is, that 'twas the Prophet's Design, to represent the State of the Church in the latter Days in a *mystical Manner*, and that therefore he does it in *Jewish Phrases*: But how each Phrase is to be applied to Gospel-Times, (if we understand what he says of these Times. as all do not) is as Mr. *Clark* says*, no easy, nor indeed, possible Task at present (if one may judge, as he says, of what may be done, by what hath been done.) This, I think, is true, and undeniable, that if *Shiloh* be come and crucified, as undoubtedly he is; that the *Jews* will never more have a Temple, Altars, Kings, &c. Their Polity is dissolyed, their Worship antiquated, and whenever God calls them, it will be to Christianity, and not to profess their old Religion. I hope Mr. *H---* hath no Design to give any Advantage to the *Jews*, and other *U*believers, by what he hath advanced: But yet I can't forbear thinking, that such Positions lead to Infidelity.

What I offer'd in my last Paragraph in the Preface, was not so much design'd to prove, that Christ was the supreme God, as to shew the Weakness of Mr. *H---*'s Observation, that *true* and *supreme* signify the same. I argued *ad Hominem*, that if this was true, it would effectually overthrow the *Arian Cause*; because God is said, in St. *John's* Epistle, to be *Light*, and Christ is said, in his Gospel, Ch. i. 9. to be the *true Light*; so that, my Conclusion from Mr. *H---*'s Premisses was just, viz. that Christ was supreme God; But the Reason, why I made such a Conclusion, was to shew, that Mr. *H---*'s way of arguing wou'd not bear the Stress that he laid upon it. And that it won't, is farther clear from the Text he now quotes, 1 *John* ii. 8. So that this Text is plainly against himself, but not against me: Because Christ and the Gospel are both call'd the true Light, i. e. according to Mr. *H---*, both are the supreme Light,

which makes it evident, that there is nothing in Mr. H---t's Remark about the Word *true*. When therefore this was all I design'd to shew, Mr. H---t, 'tis likely, wou'd have call'd it impertinent in me, if I shou'd have said as he does; "That it happens a little unluckily for me that if my Argument prove any thing, it proves, that Christ is the very Person of the Father of Christ." Was I advancing any Argument of my own to prove any thing? Nothing alas. My Business was to shew the Weakness of his Argument. This is what I did, and Mr. H---t is forced, I think, to give it up. But something he wou'd say; tho' every body, I believe, will think, that 'tis nothing to the purpose. As to my Remark on Mr. H---t's talking in the *Heathenish Language* of a *Chief God*, and a *God* that is *not Chief*, he hath said nothing, and therefore, I wou'd hope, he is ashamed of talking at this rate. And really, I can't but think, that 'twou'd be more for his Credit, to speak freely, and honestly tell the World, that our *Saviour* is a *Creature*, and nothing more, than to attempt to impose upon Mankind, by saying that our *Saviour* is *God*, when he won't allow him any thing that is peculiar to the living and true God.

When Mr. H---t comes to reply to my Book, he says, p. 6. "That I begin my furious Book with abundance of Ribaldry, and Scolding, which, says he, I heartily despise and laugh at." I believe most will think I have a better Pretence to return him the same Compliment, but I chuse rather to leave the World to judge between us, and of the *Politeness* of this way of Writing: But the Case is this. I blamed Mr. H---t for charging Bishop Pearson, and two other Persons of *great Character*, with asserting something as a Matter of Fact which they had not sufficiently examin'd; I made it evident, that this was perfectly groundless as to Bishop Pearson, and probably, as to the others also; and Mr. H---t owns, that he knew some Months ago, by the kind Assistance of some very excellent Friends, all that I said from *Archbishop Usher*. And yet, instead of making any Profession of Repentance for this *notorious Abuse*, seems to turn it into a *Jest*, and says, he'll tell me a *Riddle*, viz. "That the Creed in *Bennet Coll.* is not to be regarded, and that the Translator blunder'd in rendering *Omnipotentis* by παντοδυνάμης:" But the Question was, whether there was such a Copy. If there was, Bishop Pearson was right, tho' the *Greek Translator* shou'd be never so great a *Blunderer*. And therefore Mr. H---t ought to have own'd his Fault, and that he was too rash in censuring such great Men. This wou'd have been ingenuous and like a Scholar. But

to murder Men's Reputations at the rate Mr. H---t hath done, and then make such a lame *Excuse*, or rather *Jest* of it, is a Practice, I am sure, that Christianity doth condemn. Whether there be any other Copies in the World, is not, I apprehend, material. Bishop *Pearson* refers to one, and but to one, tho' he speaks of Copies. This is sufficient to justify Bishop *Pearson*, &c. and convict Mr H---t. And when any can give themselves such Liberties, and manifest nothing like Repentance, but rather turn it into *Ridicule*; the Character of such seems to be too much of a Complexion with that of the Person whom *Solomon* condemns, *Prov. xxvi. 18. 9. who throws Firebrands, Arrow and Death, to deceive*, or otherwise (as I may add agreeably to the Sense of the Text) abuse his Neighbour, and saith am I not in sport?

Mr. H---t proceeds next, p. 7. to consider what I say on his third Discourse of the Knowledge of Christ. And here, I think, he hath contented himself with one of the *weakest Defences* of his Discourse that I ever saw, and hath very tamely left me in the Possession of almost all that I offer'd upon that Head, tho' to the utter *Ruin*, I think, of his own Scheme. The little that he says in the first Place, p. 7. is, "that I enter into a Discourse about an *Instrumental Creator*;" upon which he says, I must not make Meanings for him, "and that he wou'd have me take his Sense on this Head" in those excellent Words of Dr. *Waterland*," *That the Father as Supreme, issued out Orders for the Creation of the World, and the Son executed them.* But with what Face or Truth cou'd Mr. H---t say, that these are Dr. *Waterland's* Words? The Words, I allow, are in Dr. *Waterland's* Book*: But then, he doth not deliver them as his own; only he says, That the general Opinion of the Antients center'd in this: But 'tis plain, that he doth not like the Expressions; and therefore he says, "That tho' the Antients had a very good Meaning and Intent in assigning (as it were) to the three Persons, their several Parts or Provinces in the Work of Creation; yet he also says, that these Things are not to be strictly and rigorously interpreted according to the Letter; but *διανοητικῶς*, and *πνευματικῶς*. And that the Design of all was, 1. To keep up a more lively Sense of a real Distinction of Persons. 2. To teach us the indivisible Unity and Co-essentiality of all three as of one Creator. 3. To signify wherein that Unity consists, or in what it ultimately resolves, viz. into Unity of Principle, one *Ἀρχὴ*,

* Dr. *Waterland's* Defence, p. 184, 185.

"Head, Root, Fountain of all." Mr. *H---* is pleased to call it *Lying* and *Forgery* in me, when I give no such Occasion. What then would he call it in his Language, if I had abused him, as he hath Dr. *Waterland*, and the World by making the Dr. say, what he did evidently oppose, and palming it upon the World, as if his Notions in this Case did not differ from the Doctor's, whereas Light and Darkness can't differ more? The Doctor himself did long ago take notice of this Abuse. "To compleat all, says he, having once found out the Secret of fetching in what, and whom they pleased, they have proceeded farther to drag in me with the rest into the very Doctrine that I had been lately confuting." This is what Mr. *H---* hath attempted to do; but this (as the Doctor says in another Place) is become greatly contemptible†. Mr. *H---*'s Business, if he would have said any thing to the Purpose, was to answer what I had offer'd about Christ's being an Instrumental Creator: But this, I presume, he found was not to be done, and therefore slides it over by quoting something as Dr. *Waterland*'s, which he confutes. What a laudable way is this of managing Controversies?

But tho' such a Method as this can never be justified, but deserve Abhorrence; yet much after the same manner he deals by me in the same Page. "You say, says he, that Christ knows the Father's Thoughts by immediate Intuition, &c." Whereas I don't say, or attempt to prove, that Christ knows the Father's Thoughts by immediate Intuition: But what I say is, that Christ doth not know Things after a different manner from what the Father doth: But if the Father knows Christ's Thoughts by immediate Intuition, Christ knows the Father's Thoughts by the like Intuition; and for this I quoted *John* x. 15. which plainly proves, I think, what I intended, viz. That there is no Difference between the Father's and Son's Knowledge. This I take to be clear from the Text: But how the Father and Son do know each other the Scripture hath not told us. 'Tis Mr. *H---* that says, and not the Scripture, that the Father knows Christ by immediate Intuition. 'Tis possible perhaps, this may be the Way; but whether it be or no, I dare not say. This is clear, that the Scriptures speak of the Knowledge of both in the same Phrases. And that was sufficient Ground for my saying, that the one is not by Intuition, and the other by Revelation; that the one is not finite, and the other infinite; that the one is not limited, and the other unlimited.

* Dr. *Waterland*'s Second Defence, p. 128.

† Ibid. p. 208.

As to Mr. H---t's Interpretation of the Text I quoted, p. 7. 'Tis so flat and weak, that it cou'd deserve no notice, were not his Confirmation of it so very extraordinary. For is there the least Resemblance in those Phrases, *As the Father knoweth me, so know I the Father*, and, *I know my Sheep, and am known of mine*? And besides, what a shocking Intimation doth it carry in it, viz. That the Knowledge of those whom Christ calls his Sheep, doth bear the same Proportion to his Knowledge, that his doth unto the Father's? If this is what he wou'd insinuate, as it seems to be, I don't see how it can be excused from *Blasphemy*. 'Tis nothing like a Proof of such a weak and imperfect Knowledge, that Christ speaks of himself *as sent by the Father*, and *that all things are deliver'd to him by the Father*, &c. For these Phrases, if they shou'd be allow'd to relate to our Saviour, consider'd in his *highest Capacity*, yet they import no more than a *voluntary and economical Subjection* of our Blessed Saviour; not any *real Inferiority of Nature*, of *Knowledge*, or *other Perfections*, any more than it doth, that a Prince must be of another Nature, or superior in Wisdom, to all the Ambassadors that are sent by him. Our Saviour, tho' *God over all*, or one that had *all the Fulness of the Godhead in him*, was yet freely and most graciously consenting to be manifest in Flesh for the Benefit and Salvation of Mankind. This was a most astonishing Evidence of a rich and most amazing Love, but not of *Meanness* and *Infinite Distance* from the Father: But Mr. H---t and some others seem to have taken Occasion hence, to rob him of his *Godhead*, and *Glorry*; 'tis therefore too soft to say, that this is the most *glaring Ingratitude*, for it deserves a great deal worse Name.

I am not sensible of any Inconveniency, if I shou'd allow to Mr. H---t, that some of the Texts I bring, wherein the Divine Omniscience is represented, do speak of one single Person, particularly of the Person of the Father: But then, there are other Texts that I bring that speak the same thing of another Person, viz. the Person of the Son. Mr. H---t, if he wou'd have done any thing to answer me, shou'd have shewn, that the same Phrases have a quite different Signification when apply'd to the Father, from what they have when apply'd to the Son, otherwise my Argument stands good; That if the Father be Omniscient, so is the Son; because the *High Ascriptions* that are made to both in the Scriptures, are the very same. Mr. H---t, I presume, cou'd not tell how to answer this, at least, he was wise enough not to think fit to meddle with it; and whoever doth, will, I believe, find it a vain Attempt. 'Tis very fine to hear Mr. H---t talking,

talking, p. 8. of the Persons of the Trinity; when every one, I believe, knows that his Trinity is, That the Father alone is True God; and the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* are two Creatures, or Made Beings: But to let this pass, which seems design'd (how honestly he himself best knows) to make the World think that he holds a Trinity, and that there is no Difference between us; Mr. H---t tells us, " That it hath often been observ'd, and never answer'd, that when ever we can be sure that more Persons of the Trinity than one speak, they say, *We, Us, Our*;" and for this he quotes several Texts. Mr. H---t must either know, that 'tis not true what he says, that this hath not been answer'd, or else own himself a Stranger to a great deal that hath been said in answer to the Argument that is brought from the *Personal Char Acters*. And as to the Texts he himself brings, he is very unhappy; for any Reader might see, that they evidently confute his own Notions, if he had quoted all the Passages fairly where these Scriptures are found: For both in *Genesis*, and also *Isaiah*, a *Plurality in Unity* is evidently spoken of. Thus, *Gen. i. 26.* it is, *God said, Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness*; and then it follows, *ver. 27.* *So God created Man in his own Image, &c.* Mr. H---t, I believe, won't say but that it is the same God that speaks both *Singularly* and *Plurally*; which shews that the Godhead consists of more than one Person. And the same Observation may be made upon *Isaiah vi. 8.* *And the Lord said, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?* The Change of the Numbers, *I*, and *Us*, when yet they are spoken of the same Lord, is very remarkable, and plainly shews, that according to Scripture Language, *I* and *Us* may very properly be predicated of the same Lord. And moreover, if we compare the VIth of *Isaiah* with the New Testament, we may observe, that what is here said of the Lord of Hosts, is apply'd both to our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*, *John xii. 41.* *Acts xxviii. 25, 26.* And that there is here Respect also had to the Father, I take it for granted Mr. H---t will not deny. So that there can be nothing in what Mr. H---t says, That what I advance will prove that Christ is the Person of the Father. I am vain enough to think, that I don't use to talk after this silly rate. I make no Difficulty to allow to Mr. Hallet, that *John xiv. 23.* *John xvii. 21, 22.* belong to the Father, and our Blessed Saviour; but can't possibly see to what End they are brought, unless to prove, what Mr. H---t hath Reason to know I never deny'd, That the *Father* and *Son* are two Persons. These Texts I am sure can make nothing against me: But there is one Question that I wou'd beg

beg leave to put to Mr. *H---t*, from these Texts, that may deserve his serious Consideration, and that is, How he can bring himself to believe that our Saviour wou'd ever speak in the Language that he doth in these Texts, of the Father and Himself, if there was such an infinite Distance between them as Mr. *H---t* makes. Mr. *H---t* hath said nothing to convince me, or that is likely to convince any other Person, that the Apostles don't ascribe an all-comprehensive Knowledge to Christ. And if they did, when he had no such Knowledge, 'twas as I said *fulsome* and *blasphemous Applause*.

I cou'd have no End, that I know, in concealing these Words, *By this we believe thou comest forth from God*; and therefore can't see, how I dealt unfairly with the Text. Mr. *H---t* must be very weak to think that these Words are at all against me. Christ owns it, and I never deny'd it, *that he came forth from God the Father*. Nay, 'twas by this very thing that the Apostles were confirm'd in it that our Saviour had that infinite all-comprehensive Knowledge that they ascrib'd to him, and I have been pleading for. Mr. *H---t*, if he wou'd have done any thing against me, shou'd have shewn, that to know all things, and the Hearts of Men, was not peculiar to God: But this is against plain Scripture, *1 Kings* viii. 39. *Jer.* xvii. 10. And therefore 'tis a poor Calumny to say, "That every one, besides me, sees that Christ's perfect Knowledge of the Creation is perfectly sufficient, in point of Knowledge, to qualify the Son of God to hear Mens Prayers, and to be their final Judge." I readily allow all this, and never suggested the contrary; but yet add withal, that nothing higher in *Phrase*, and therefore not in *Sense*, is said in Scripture of the Father's Knowledge, than is of Christ's. The Scriptures don't speak of God's knowing things without the Creation: If Christ hath a perfect Knowledge of the Creation, it is sufficient, and the *highest* thing that is said in Scripture of the *divine Knowledge*; which was the thing to be proved. And this shews, by the way, that Christ's having such a Knowledge is a clear Proof, that *whatever else the Father hath, is his*; according to what our Saviour himself says, *ver.* 14. Our Saviour here asserts his Claim to all the Divine Perfections, as well as that of Omniscience. Indeed, they all go together, and can't be separated from the *Divine Nature*. As to the Texts, *Matth.* xxiv. 36. *Mark* xiii. 32. which I undertook to answer, I think I have sufficiently answer'd all that looks like Objection in them; and if Mr. *H---t* did not think so, 'twas his Business, I think, to shew wherein I was defective, and not put me off in such a trifling Manner, *p.* 8. "That they are not to be answer'd, but

" to

“ to be believ’d as God’s Word.” As such, I assure Mr. H---t, I do believe them: But not the Interpretation that he puts upon them, or the Inference that he and others wou’d draw from them. Shou’d I, in my Turn, tell Mr. H---t that Christ is said to be *God over all*; that *in him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily*; that *in him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge*; that *all things were made by him and for him*; that *he is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, &c.* and then say that these things are not to be answer’d, but believ’d; how very ridiculous wou’d Mr. H---t represent it in me? But it seems he may take a Liberty to trifle, tho’ others may not. The Expressions (which Mr. H---t says are not to be answer’d, but believ’d as God’s Word) ’tis certain have a determinate Sense, and I have endeavour’d to shew what it is; and still must think (for any thing that appears to the contrary from Mr. H---t) that I have sufficiently obviated the Objections of *Crellius*, Mr. *Emlyn*, and others, upon this Head; if I have not, Mr. H---t should have shewn the contrary, and not refer me to a *stale Passage* that hath more than once been sufficiently answered several Years ago: But seeing he only refers me to the *Passage*, I think it sufficient only to refer him to the Answer to these Queries, and this Passage in particular, which was publish’d, 1721. The Query was, “ Whether they who say, “ the Son did know the Day and Hour of the last Judgment, when he said expressly he did not; whether, I say, “ they don’t make Christ guilty of Equivocation, &c.? ” To which this Answer was return’d, *viz.* “ That there was “ no Equivocation in saying what was literally true, that “ the Son, as Son of Man, did not know the Day and Hour “ of the last Judgment. The Context it self sufficiently limits his Denial to his *Human Nature*. The Querist tells “ us, that according to this Way of Equivocation, a Man “ (as one observes) may deny that he saw a thing, which he “ actually saw; meaning, he did not see it with one Eye, “ which he wilfully kept shut, while he beheld it with the “ other. But as one observes (says the Answerer) (see Mr. “ *Boyse*, in his Reply to that Pretence of Mr. *Emlyn*’s) in “ Answer to this idle Stuff, There might be some Colour “ for the Pretence, if a Man had two *visive Powers*, or “ *two Souls*, as well as *two Eyes*: But seeing he hath but “ one *visive Power*, and one *Soul*, which one *Soul* sees, whether one Eye only, or both, be open, it wou’d be a downright Falshood to say, I saw not a thing at all, because I saw it but with one Eye. But the Case is quite different “ where there are two *knowing Principles*, belonging to two “ different

“ different Natures ; one of which may *see*, or *know*, while
 “ the other doth not *see*, or *know* ; and consequently it may
 “ be *deny'd* of one, which may be *affirm'd* of the other. It
 “ cou'd not indeed be *absolutely* and *indefinitely* deny'd of
 “ Christ that he *knew the Day*, neither is it so *deny'd* in
 “ Scripture, but in a *certain* Respect only, which the Rea-
 “ son of the thing, and the very *Context* determines it to :
 “ For it speaks not of the *Son of God* as such, but of the
 “ *Son of Man*, or of *Christ* consider'd as *Son of Man* *.”

Mr. H----t, in the same Page, says I bring in some other Texts by the Bye, and relating to other Matters ; but I think, to the Purpose, and to the Argument I was upon. If not, Mr. H----t wou'd hardly have contented himself with so soft and gentle an Animadversion, and to refer me to Books (but what Books he doth not say) that have treated of them, for an Answer. This, I confess, is a short and easy Way ; but 'tis no hard Matter to guess why I am referr'd to Books, and in the same Page referr'd again to a Pamphlet, which Mr. H----t says is Mr. P---ce's, for an Answer to *Jude* 4. and *2 Pet.* ii. 1. to which, he says, I have given no Reply. Mr. H----t, I believe, must know, that the Reason why it had no Reply was, because the Pamphlet was never own'd by Mr. P---ce, and I had declar'd before, that I shou'd not think my self concern'd to answer anonymous Writers : But now I am inform'd by Mr. H----t it is Mr. P---ce's, I take the Liberty to say, upon a Perusal of what Mr. H----t calls a Reply to these Texts, That Mr. P---ce hath said nothing to them, that can justly be call'd an Answer ; nothing material but what Dr. *Whitby* had said before, which was without Foundation ; and which I have effectually, I think, over-turn'd in my *Preservative* ; and this I take to be the true Reason why Mr. H----t wou'd not venture upon an Answer. He must see, that the Texts were too hard for one who was vastly his Superior, and therefore, like a prudent Man, hath let them alone : But besides, whatever Mr. P---ce had said, 'twas Mr. H----t's Concern to say something to them, if they were to be answer'd ; because in my *Preservative* they are offer'd for somewhat a different End from what they were in my *Truth and Liberty consistent*. I shall therefore presume to look upon these Texts also as unanswerable ; and whether Mr. H----t hath over-turn'd what I offer'd from *1 John* v. 20. shall be consider'd in its proper Place ; and therefore shall proceed to consider what he hath said in Vindication of his seventh Discourse.

* *An Answer to some Queries printed at Exon, p. 19, 20.*

Mr. H---t begins his Vindication, p. 9. with his usual Politeness, calling what I offer, p. 35 a tedious Harangue. I there blam'd him for representing the Doxology in *St. Matthew* as no part of Scripture, when he had nothing to object against the Doxology it self, and so very little to support his Assertion, viz. that it was added from latter Authors, and the Liturgies of the Church. I had no Desire that he shou'd suppress Truth, as he very charitably suggests in his Question, or serve any Designs of *Priestcraft*. These I ever had, and shall have in much Detestation: But surely there can be no Harm in suppressing *Falshoods*, and *groundless Fancies*, tho' we are thereby forced to keep our Learning to our selves; and this is all that I aimed at in what Mr. H---t calls, in his civil Way, my tedious Harangue. I can't see how he cou'd think it necessary (as he says, p. 10.) to maintain his Argument, to be so particular (in me Mr. H---t wou'd have call'd it tedious) upon the Story in *Lucian's Philopatris*, unless he'll call it his Argument to join Issue with a *Profane, Bantering, and Atheistical Heathen*, in ridiculing the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. Mr. H---t doth not disown, that 'twas his Intention to ridicule the common Doxology that Christians use: But then, instead of saying any thing to what I offer, p. 37. viz. That he might as well ridicule the *Baptismal Form*, and what we usually call the *Apostolical Benediction*. He very gravely puts me this Question, upon my saying that this Doxology is perfectly agreeable to the Sense of Scripture, tho' not found there in so many Words; "How I, as one professing to dissent from the Church of *England*, because it requires unscriptural Terms of Communion, can vindicate my self, upon this Principle, in the Use of an unscriptural Doxology?" To which very wise Question I answer, That I never use any such. The Doxologies I use are either in *Scripture Words*, or according to *Scripture-Sense*, and therefore can't be *unscriptural*. I don't therefore impose any unscriptural Terms upon any in the Use of the common Doxology, any more than I do in other parts of Prayer, where I don't use all Scripture-Expressions. Mr. H---t puts another Question; "Did not the inspir'd Apostles best know what kind of Doxology was most suited to the Doctrine of Christ, and most agreeable to the Will of God?" I answer, Undoubtedly they did: But then, Mr. H---t hath done nothing to convince me, that the Doxology I use is not of this Nature, and I am perfectly satisfy'd that it is. And then, as to my *zealous Friends* whom Mr. H---t represents as industriously avoiding every Scripture-Form of Doxology, I have this to say for them, That they

note. have too much Sense to be banter'd out of what Mr. H---t by way of *Sneer* calls their *Orthodoxy*; and that if he wou'd convince either them or me, it must be by Reason and Scripture; we are not so weak as to be impress'd by any thing else. Nor is it true, that we industriously avoid any of the *Scripture Doxologies*; we approve of them all; I have often heard them used. I sometimes use them my self, and scarce ever fail, at the End of one of my Prayers, to use the Scripture Doxology that I am defending. But if I never used the very Scripture Forms, as long as none of my Doxologies are contrary to Scripture, but perfectly agreeable to the Sense thereof, I am safe. I don't know that I am obliged, either in Prayer or Praise, to use none but Scripture Expressions: And if I did use them, but put the Sense upon them that Mr. H---t and some others do, tho' there cou'd be no Exception against the Expression, yet neither my Prayers or Praises might for all that be *agreeable to Scripture*. The Scriptures may be wrested, and I think I have made it abundantly evident, that Mr. H---t doth wrest them, and that he doth it most notoriously in the most solemn Concerns he hath with God, seeing he denies all Worship to the *Holy Ghost*, to whom in Baptism he was devoted; and only worships our Saviour as a *Creature*, or *Made Being*. If Mr. H---t can excuse such Worship from being *Sacrilegious* and *Idolatrous*, I can't.

Mr. H---t, in p. 11. speaking about the MSS. of St. *Matthew's* Gospel, which I had been considering, says, "that it looks odd, that I shou'd roundly say, that the Doxology is in the most ancient *Greek* MSS. because I allow, that the *Cambridge* and *Vatican* are some of the oldest." But with Mr. H---t's Leave, there is nothing in this that is at all odd, for even a very small Measure of Candour wou'd have let him see, that there is nothing in this that cou'd deserve his Censure; for when I had with so much Reason rejected the *Cambridge* and *Vatican* MSS. because so miserably mangled, interpolated, and spoil'd, as the Learned think, by the *Latin Scribes*, Mr. H---t cou'd not well understand my Meaning to be any other than this, *viz.* That the Doxology was in the most ancient *Greek* MSS. that were good for any thing, or worthy of Regard. By which he must understand, I intended that at *Basil*, and the *fifteen* that *Brugensis* had seen at *Paris*, all which had the Doxology. Accordingly I said, after Mr. *Jones*, the *best*, as well as *most ancient*; which, for a Reason best known to himself, Mr. H---t left out.

I thought I had said enough to put Mr. H---t out of Conceit

ceit with *Origen*. But Mr. *H---t* says, p. 11. " I have unhappily betray'd my self, &c." But not so much perhaps as he may imagine; for as to the Book entitled *Περὶ ἰουχῆς*, 'tis only suppos'd, but not certain, that it was writ by *Origen*; and therefore nothing, I think, can be justly pleaded as to *Origen's Opinion* from this Book: But if it be really *Origen's*, it hath been translated into *Latin* as well as other of his Works; and if it had not, why might not he, according to his too common Custom, leave out this as well as other Passages of Scripture, when he was writing his Commentaries; and especially if he used that scandalous *Nazarene-Copy* which he had such a fond Regard for. Mr. *H---t* calls it very impertinent in me, p. 12. that I suggest this; but for such a strange Reason as every one will presently see where the Impertinency (if any be) lies, when I mention it. " However (says Mr. *H---t*) he might happen to forget some part of a Text in other Places, 'tis extremely unlikely he shou'd forget the Doxology, which, if it was as ancient as the Gospel, he must certainly have often read, and heard repeated, and learn'd, when he learn'd the Lord's Prayer." Wonderful Reasoning! for hath not Mr. *H---t* himself often read, heard, repeated, and learn'd the Lord's-Prayer with the Doxology; and yet when he comes to write about it, he discards it? and why might not *Origen* do the same, when he writ his Commentaries? There might be no Defect in his Memory, but an Alteration in his Judgment; and this might happen thro' the extravagant Regard he had to his *Nazarene Copy*. By this every one may plainly see where the great Impertinency mention'd by Mr. *H---t* will stick; nor will it help him at all, that he quotes the *Inquiry into the Constitution*, &c. p. 35, 38. Part II. By referring us to this Learned Author, one wou'd imagine that Mr. *H---t* wou'd have it believ'd, that he reason'd as he doth; (or else I can't see to what Purpose he is quoted) but as this Learned Author doth always reason after another Rate, so all that is said of *Origen*, p. 35, 36. (for in p. 38. there's not a Word spoken of him) is, That Christ gave us a Prayer, with which he commanded us to pray unto the Father. Whether it had, or had not the Doxology, is not said; and therefore I leave it to the World to be consider'd, whether there be not something worse than Impertinence, in referring to a Book (of so great and just a Reputation as the *Enquiry*) as countenancing that which it hath not one word about, except in favour of what I say, which it hath, p. 34. and quotes *Origen de Oratione* for it.

'Twas no Vanity in me, as Mr. *H---t* suggests, p. 12. to mention

mention an Observation of Dr. *Towerson*, and other Learned Men, that the Prayer wou'd seem imperfect without the Doxology, I mention'd another Observation, *p. 45.* which (for a Reason that may be easily guess'd) Mr. *H---t* hath thought convenient to pass over, as he hath most things that are material. St. *Luke*, notwithstanding what Mr. *H---t* suggests, is, I think, sufficiently secur'd from all Reflexion, (tho' he omit the Doxology) by what I say, *p. 55, 56.* and therefore I can't but complain of it as very unfair in Mr. *H---t*, that he should make that an Objection, which I had fully obviated and answer'd before.

But what Name doth it deserve, that Mr. *H---t* in *p. 12.* shou'd represent me as arguing, " That because *David* did " *begin* a Prayer with blessing God, and ascribing Glory to " him, therefore 'tis likely Christ wou'd, *after this Example,* " *conclude* his Prayer with a Doxology?" Let the Reader be pleas'd to look into *p. 45.* of my *Preservative*, and there he'll see, that my Words are, and why may'nt we say with great probability, that our Saviour also (who never cared to differ from the *Jews* any farther than was necessary) might in directing his Disciples to pray, put a farther Honour upon *David*, whose *Son*, and *Lord* he was, by inserting a Part of his excellent Prayer into his own? I leave it to the candid Reader, whether I am not very abusively treated, when I han't a Word of *Beginning*, or *Concluding*, which Additions of his own, if taken away, wou'd spoil his *fest* upon me, but now, can't fail to expose himself. If Mr. *H---t* will advance Things which he can't defend, let him however be just to those who oppose him, and not take such *unbecoming Methods* to cover over his own Weakness.

Mr. *H---t* wou'd fain make something of it *p. 12.* that the Doxology in St. *Matth.* is not repeated by the Apostles among all their Doxologies: But this is far enough from shewing, that they did not derive their Custom of using frequent Doxologies from this *Directory* of our Saviour that I have been defending; but it serves much however to confirm an Observation I made, *viz.* That it was given by our Saviour as a *Directory*, rather than a *Form*: But yet, I allow, it may be very safely used to either of these Purposes. And take it how we will, there cou'd be no Occasion for its being repeated; but that there shou'd be so many *Doxologies* in the *Scripture-Epistles*, and *Primitive Writers*, and no Direction given about it by our Saviour himself, will seem strange to any that shall consider Things with Calmness and Judgment.

I have

I had said so much to sink the Credit of the *Cambridge* and *Vatican* MSS. that most Men of Sense, I believe, will think, that Mr. *H---t* must have little to say, when he is still harping upon this old String: And really, it must be a very poor Cause, that must be supported, as Mr. *H---t* doth his, by *new* Calumnies, p. 12, 13. and two old MSS. that are good for little or nothing: But Mr. *H---t* seems very loth to give up his Cause, tho' he can't defend it. And accordingly, says he, p. 13. "To the *Greek* MS. from which "the *Gothick* Version was made, I oppose that from which "the *Saxon* was made." That is, according to Dr. *Mill*, he opposeth a *Version* that was made from a *Version*, and that a very corrupt one, to a *Version* that was made from a most excellent *Greek Exemplar*, or MS*. This shews, that Mr. *H---t* is resolved to *bluster*, tho' at the Expence of exposing himself and Cause. As to the *Latin Version*, which he also opposeth to the *Gothick*, I shall have Occasion to consider it by and by.

Mr. *H---t* says, p. 13. "That my Translation of the "Doxology in *Polycarp's* Prayer, unhappily shews, either "that I don't understand the *plainest Greek*, or else, that I "have wickedly mis-translated it, to serve a Turn of Or- "thodoxy." But I wou'd here beg leave to advise Mr. *H---t* to forbear such Language, seeing these Censures perhaps may be too rash and hasty, and only the Effects, either of *Ignorance*, or too much *Rage* against me: For as to the Translation itself, I find it to be perfectly agreeable (except in the Translation of the Word *δοξάζω*, which Mr. *H---t* hath no Objection against) with the Translation of the learned Author of *the Enquiry into the Constitution of the Primitive Church* †, who can't be suspected of being ignorant of the *Greek Language*, or of having any *wicked Design*. This learned Author, I own, might have render'd *in with*, as I intended to have done, to prevent all Objection, and this would have been agreeable to our own Translation in several Instances where the *Preposition in* is used, and translated *with*, which would have served my Purpose, as well as *and*. I'll mention two Instances, (1.) *Matth. iii. 11.* αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίζει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ. *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.* (2.) The like Instance we have *Acts i. 5.* ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας. *But ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many Days hence.* If therefore instead of *and*, I had put *with*, it wou'd have serv'd my Design as well; but *and*, I thought, wou'd

* *Mill. Prolegom. p. 151, 152. Edit. Kust.*

† *Enquiry. &c. P. II. p. 34.*

make it run a little more easily, and therefore, as I knew, that I had faithfully preserv'd *Polycarp's* Sense, so I cou'd justly deserve no blame, that I gave it the rendering that I did. That this rendering is perfectly consonant to *Polycarp's* Sense will appear from two very ancient Interpretations of part of *Polycarp's* Prayer and Doxology, as preserv'd in *Socrates*, one made by *Rufinus*, and the other also of very great Antiquity, both which I shall crave the Reader's Leave to insert, to shew, that I had no Turn of *Orthodoxy* to serve but what is very honourable. The first I shall mention runs thus, *Ob hanc rem te benedico in omnibus, et glorior, per Aeternum Pontificem Omnipotentem Jesum Christum per quem tibi, et cum ipso, et cum Spiritu sancto, Gloria nunc et in futurum in secula seculorum, Amen. i. e.* For this reason I bless thee in all Things, and praise thee, through the eternal and omnipotent High-Priest Christ Jesus, through whom, to thee, and with him, and with the Holy Ghost, be Glory, now, and henceforward, to eternal Ages, *Amen**. The latter part of the Doxology, according to *Rufinus's* Interpretation runs thus, *Per Aeternum Deum et Pontificem Jesum Christum, dilectum filium tuum: Per quem, et cum quo, tibi cum Spiritu sancto, Gloria, &c. i. e.* Through the eternal God, and High-Priest, thy beloved Son; through whom, and with whom, to thee, with the Holy Ghost, be Glory, &c.†. The great and very learned Archbishop *Usher* (to whose Writings I am obliged as in the Margin for these Interpretations) observes, that were it not for these Interpretations that I have mentioned, the Doxology of *Polycarp*, as preserv'd in *Eusebius*, might be suspected as made in favour of the *Arians*, because the *Prepositions* in this Doxology are changed, and not the same as in the Doxology preserv'd by *Socrates*, which he thinks to be the true one; because it came from *Irenaeus*, who was *Polycarp's* Disciple, and runs as in the Margin‡; and in *English* thus, For this Reason, and for all Things, I will praise thee, I will bless thee, I will glorify thee with the eternal and heavenly Christ Jesus thy beloved Son, with whom, to thee, and the Holy Ghost, be Glory, &c.

What I have offer'd puts it beyond all doubt, that I cou'd not have preserv'd *Polycarp's* Sense, unless I had translated the *in with*, or *and* as (to make it run a little more fluently) I have done. I wou'd hope, Mr. H----t was a perfect

* *Vid. Usher. de S. Polycar. Martyr. p. 25.* † *Usher. in acta Polycarp. p. 66.*
‡ Διὰ τὸτο καὶ περὶ πάντων αἰῶνι σε, ὑπολογῶ σε, δοξάζω σε συν τῷ αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἀπερανίστῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητῷ σε παιδὶ μεθ' ἃ σοὶ καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα, καὶ ᾧ καὶ εἰς τὰς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν. *Usher. de S. Polycarpi Martyrio. p. 25.*

Stranger to all this, or else, he wou'd never by his high and reproachful Charges have given me a Handle to set this Matter in a Light that can never be for his Honour. As therefore I have not in the least perverted *Polycarp's Sense*, so it must be evident, that I cou'd have no Turn to serve but that of Truth. I wish Mr. *H---t* might not have a worse Turn to serve than I had. 'Tis very plain that he hath perverted the Sense of *Polycarp's Doxology*; but I wou'd charitably believe he hath done it, because he knew no better: But if he did, every one must see, where the Charge of *Wickedness* that he hath advanced against me must rest; and what very odd and unjustifiable Methods some will take to advance the *Arian Cause*. But is it not, after all, very strange, that such Persons, when they have nothing else to say, shou'd seem to think, that by loading Persons with Charges of *Ignorance*, and *Wickedness*, and passing a *poor Sneer* upon *Orthodoxy*, they have done *Wonders*, and answer'd every thing?

Mr. *H---t* is not fair, *p.* 13. in representing what I say about *Liturgies*: For besides what he quotes, I say, *p.* 54. If Persons wou'd be at the pains to read what several learned Men have said, they must, I believe, be convinced, that there were no such *Liturgies* in being, as this *Doxology* is said to be taken from till the fifth Century, and that therefore the *Doxology* must be older than these *Liturgies* from which it is said to be taken. This Mr. *H---t* shou'd have quoted, but then it wou'd have spoiled the Questions that he puts, and his reasoning against me, *p.* 13. But farther, he says, there were *Liturgies* in *Chrysostom's* Time, and that is enough, and for this quotes Mr. *P---ce*, *p.* 14. I allow, that Mr. *Pierce* speaks to this Purpose; *Vind. of Dissent.* Part 3. *p.* 423. 2d Edit. But does he say, that there were any settled *Liturgies*, or such as are called *Church Liturgies*, (from which the *Doxology* in the Lord's Prayer might be added?) No, this is what he was arguing against. If therefore they used any Forms of Prayer (which yet is very uncertain) they were Forms of their own composing, and for their own particular Use. And even Mr. *P---ce* says, and Mr. *H---t* by quoting him owns in Effect, that no *Council* or *Emperor* prescribed the same *Form* of Prayers to all the Ministers in a *Province*; and how then cou'd these with any Propriety or Truth be call'd *Church-Liturgies*? And farther, can it ever be thought, that *Chrysostom* wou'd make a *Doxology* that he did not find in the *Greek Copies* that he had, and then add it to Scripture, and afterwards expound it, and preach upon it as part of God's Word? Such a piece

of gross and abominable Forgery must have ruined *Chrysostom's* Reputation effectually: But Mr. H---t, I believe, is the first Person that ever suggested any thing of this Nature against *Chrysostom*. But farther, there is much reason to think, that there was no such thing as a *Liturgy* or *Form* in *Chrysostom's* Time, unless we shall call a *Psalm-Book*, or the *Lord's Prayer* by that Name: And for this I refer to Mr. *Robinson's* Answer to Mr. *Bennet*, p. 183. to 185. where a full Answer may be seen to what is urg'd from *Chrysostom* upon this Head.

Mr. H---t says, p. 14. " That 'tis prodigiously unaccountable in me to speak as I do of the *Latin* Version, and the *Latin* Fathers who follow'd it, as not fit to decide in this Dispute, and that I shou'd treat the *Arabick* Version in the *Polyglot*, the *Coptick*, and the *Saxon* that were made from the *Latin* MSS. with Contempt; because their Authority hath been pleaded to defend the Genuineness of that contested Passage, 1 *John* v. 7, 8." Now I readily allow to Mr. H---t, that this hath been offer'd by some to justify the retaining of this Passage as a part of sacred Scripture. But why shou'd this be so unaccountable? And what Occasion cou'd there be for Mr. H---t's Exclamation? " Oh! the Force of Bigotry and Zeal, which hath now led you so eagerly to condemn them! I beseech you be a little more consistent with yourself for your own Reputation's Sake." But here, I wou'd beg leave again to advise Mr. H---t, not to be so rash and hasty: For might I not in my Turn say, That 'tis prodigiously unaccountable in Mr. H---t, to be so very zealous for the *Latin* Version, and Fathers: and yet allow, as 'tis said, no Room in his Bible for this Text, when yet it is in the *Latin Version*; and when *Cyprian*, *Tertullian*, &c. quote it as a part of Scripture? Might I not also say with more Reason, Oh! the Force of Bigotry in those that deny the *Godhead* of our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*! But I forbear making such a Return, as sensible, that such *Exclamations* carry nothing of *Argument*, and very often betray a want of it, as plainly it doth, in the present Case: For Mr. H---t might have observ'd, that tho' I speak of this Version as very corrupt, and full of Faults and Blunders, p. 49. yet I also say there, that it is especially thus corrupted in the Gospels. And then, in what Respect am I more inconsistent with myself, than the very learned Dr. *Mill*? For tho' no one can blame the *Latin Version* more than he doth; yet he pleads, that it hath justly preserv'd this Passage, and makes it highly probable at least, that *Cyprian* and *Tertullian* who quote it, recover'd

recover'd it from some *Greek Copies* that they got a Sight of. He also gives a probable Account, how it came to be dropp'd at first out of some MSS. and how this Omission might spread, and become more general afterwards. Mr. *H---t* says, " it is not found in any *Greek MS.* now in the " World, older than Printing, except one in *Ireland* written since the End of the *Tenth Century*." This, I believe, is much more than Mr. *H---t* knows; for tho' some may be more regardless of MSS. now, than they were before Printing came in Fashion, yet I can hardly think that all those MSS. are lost that were used by the Compilers of the *Complutensian*, by *Robert Stephens*, and by *Beza*, in their Editions of the New Testament; for to say nothing of the noble *Complutensian Edition*, *Robert Stephens*, who put out an Edition of the New Testament, in which this Passage is, in the Year 1549 tells us, that he was assisted by Books to which he gives this Title, *Vetustatis specie penè adorandos*, i. e. almost worthy to be ador'd for their Antiquity; from which his Edition did not differ so much as in one Letter; upon which the learned Dr. *Mill* says, (who was a much better Judge of these Matters than Mr. *H---t*, or I) that he wou'd never have given them this Title, unless they had been 700, or rather 800 Years old*. To the same Purpose, *Beza* (whose Edition came out 1556.) tells us, that he himself had read the contested Passage in some of *Stephens's* old Books, which he would never have ventured to say, when *Stephens* himself was the Printer, if not true; and very probable it is, that these were the very *ancient Books* that *Stephens* himself speaks of. If therefore all these Books be not lost, Mr. *H---t* must be greatly mistaken, that there is no *Greek MS.* in the World that hath the Passage, older than Printing, except one in *Ireland*, &c. Farther, if Dr. *Mill* be right, Mr. *H---t* is greatly mistaken in saying, that this Passage is to be found in no *Greek Father* but *Manuel Colecas* of the 14th Century. Why *Manuel* is call'd a *Father* by Mr. *H---t*, I don't know; but as to Mr. *H---t's* Assertion, Dr. *Mill* says, that it is to be found in a Writer much older than this *Manuel*; namely, in the Author of the Disputation in the Council of *Nice*, under the Name of *Athanasius*, who lived in the 5th Century if not before. He quotes also *Irenæus* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, as those who had seen the *Greek MSS.* in which this Passage was; and upon the whole concludes, that we ought to retain it, and that the *Latin Version*, tho' prodigious

* *Mill, N. v. Testament. p. 585.*

giously faulty, had yet this Passage from *Greek MSS.* I hope Mr. *H---* is more modest than to exclaim against the learned Doctor (whatever he may say of me) Oh! the Force of Bigotry and Zeal! I have transgress'd in length, in answering this Paragraph; but Mr. *H---*, tho' large upon the next Chapter about the Commandments, hath yet excused me from saying very much, because he hath in effect given up the greatest part of what he had offer'd in his Collection of Notes and Discourses upon that Subject.

In vindicating this Discourse, Mr. *H---* is pleased to begin in his usual way, *p.* 14. telling me, " That I have " excessively outdone myself, and transgressed the utmost " Bounds of Decency, Truth and Christianity, and that he " easily despiseth the apparent Malice of a most tedious and " wordy Discourse, &c." But what Occasion have I given for all this Wrath? Why, Mr. *H---* talks, as if I had represented him as writing Things *dangerous to Morality*, and he tells me, not only, " that he knows he hath not, but " that Men of the greatest Sense, Penetration and Virtue " assure him, that 'tis plain he hath not." I am not solicitous to know, who these wonderful Men are; but yet may venture to believe, that Men of as much *Sense, Penetration,* and *Virtue* think he hath. He tells me, " he fully guarded " against any Misinterpretation of his Design." But it was not against his Design (which I knew nothing of) but his Book that I wrote, and fairly quoted what he had said; and if he had said no more than what he repeats *p.* 14. I shou'd not 'tis likely have taken so much notice of it: But then, what need was there of 23 Pages to prove what nobody denies, *viz.* That the ten Commandments as deliver'd to *Moses*, and by him to the *Jews*, don't bind us under that *very Consideration*, or *formally*, as Mr. *Baxter* speaks. Three Lines, as well as 23 Pages, wou'd have been sufficient to deliver such a *Notion* or *Metaphysical Nicety* to the World; and Mr. *H---*, I believe, wou'd have had no Antagonists, except as to these Expressions, That Christians are obliged to perform most of the Duties that are required, and to abstain from most of the Things that are forbidden in the ten Commandments. If Mr. *H---*'s Meaning in them was what he now says, 'twas odly enough, I think, express'd, and hardly any one, I believe, besides himself, cou'd understand, that they had only a Reference to the fourth Commandment: But to let that pass for the present, and his very notable Explication of these Expressions, I wou'd (if he can be calm after so much Wrath, which, by the way, does not seem to be the best Sign of any extraordinary Regard

gard to Morality, unless his Notions of Morality be different from those of other Men) humbly ask him, or any of his Friends whom he so much extols, whether this Paragraph be such a sufficient Guard as he speaks of, and whether this can be all (if Words signify any thing) that can be meant by such Expressions as I have quoted from him? I think, a *quatenus* deliver'd to the *Jews*, or we are not bound by any Authority, of the Law of *Moses*, can help him but little, when he says, " These Precepts in the *Jewish* " Religion that require *Moral Duties* don't oblige us. That " to say that the *Moral Part* of the ten Commandments " doth oblige Christians, is a strange and Indefensible Notion. That the New Testament is so far from obliging " Christians to obey the ten Commandments, that it frequently declares they are *abolished*, and cease to be a *Rule* " to the Church of God. That the Apostles were *no Ministers* of the ten Commandments, and therefore these " Commands don't oblige Christians; that the Apostles represent the ten Commandments and the Gospel as *two* " different and inconsistent Things, that the ten Commandments like the other Parts of the *Mosaic Law* can't be " Part of the Gospel, but are put in *Opposition* to it." I forbear to mention several other Passages, which I mentioned in my *Preservative*, because these do abundantly shew, that whatever Mr. H---t's Intention might be, these Expressions carry another Signification, than that, they don't oblige us *quatenus* deliver'd to the *Jews*, or *formally*: For tho' it shou'd be allow'd, that they don't bind us *formally*, which is the most that Mr. *Baxter* says, yet, consider'd as *Moral Precepts*, they don't, nor is it possible that they shou'd cease to be a Rule to the Church of God. And where, I beseech Mr. H---t, is the oddness of my Fancy, which he speaks of, p. 15. to represent him as declaring, that *Moral Precepts* are abolished, when his own Words are, that it is a strange and indefensible Notion, to say, that the *Moral Part* of the ten Commandments doth oblige Christians, and that the New Testament doth frequently declare that they are abolished, and cease to be a *Rule* to the Church of God?

There is not one Commandment in the ten that is not a *Moral Precept*; nor is there any Part of these Precepts that can be pretended to be of any other than a *Moral Nature*, except a very small Part of the fourth. If therefore, according to Mr. H---t, these Precepts are abolished, my Representation of him was very just, when I represent him as declaring, that *Moral Precepts* are abolished; But he says,

p. 16. I cou'd not mistake his Meaning; because of what he had said in his two Letters to Mr. *Vowler*, and his Letter to me. I am very glad to find, that he had, it seems, a good Meaning in his odd and unaccountable Expressions: But a Writer, I think, shou'd take care, that his Expressions mayn't be calculated to do Mischief. Mr. *H---t* might have a good Meaning, tho' he shou'd say, that we are not oblig'd to honour our Parents, to abstain from Murder, Adultery, Theft, False-witness, Blasphemy, &c. for his Meaning might be, that we are oblig'd indeed to abstain from these Sins, but that we are not oblig'd to abstain from these Sins, by the Laws of the ten Commandments *quatenus* deliver'd to the *Jews*. But such a way of speaking hath an ill Tendency, and is too likely to poison and pervert Mens Minds and Inclinations, before the *good Meaning* may be known, or the *poor Metaphysical Remedy* comes. And 'tis a very lame Pretence (when the *Mischief* is done) for a Man to say, that he had a *good Meaning*; that his Intentions were very harmless; that his Expressions were taken in another Sense than he intended them, tho' they cou'd not (if any Regard be had to Language) be taken otherwise; and after all (without altering the common Meaning of Words) be made consistent with what he says was his Meaning, by the powerful Help of all his *Metaphysicks*, in which he was yet obliged at last to seek for Refuge. But I am blam'd by Mr. *H---t* for writing against him, after he had explained his Meaning to Mr. *Vowler* and myself. To which I have this to offer, that what he had said to Mr. *Vowler* was not sufficient to obviate the Mischief, that his Book, which was published to the World, was likely to do: For the Controversy between him and Mr. *Vowler* was carried on in a *News-Paper*, which wou'd probably fall but into very few Hands; whereas, my Design was to make my *Preservative* as extensive as Mr. *H---t*'s Book, and to provoke to a *fair Defence*, which now I find is not practicable, or to a *publick Retraction*, which I hope I have in some small measure obtain'd, tho' I shou'd have been glad, if Mr. *H---t*'s *Temper* wou'd have allow'd him to be a little more *plain* and *explicit* in his *Retraction*. 'Tis some Satisfaction to me, that Mr. *H---t*, p. 27. hath so quietly suffer'd his *Nine Arguments*, as he calls them, to fall a Sacrifice to what I had said, and that the great Thing he hath to say in their Defence is, "That I had perfectly mistaken the Design of them, and that he had the less need to defend them, because it was already done to his Hands by the great and judicious Mr. *Baxter*." This I take to be giving

ving up the Cause as indefensible; for notwithstanding what he says of Mr. *Baxter*, he must be beholding to his *good Meanings*, or else, Mr. *Baxter's* *quatenus* or *as such* won't help him: What Mr. *Baxter's* last and most *mature Thoughts* were, I have quoted; in which, if there be any Meaning in Words, he is as expressly against what Mr. *H---t* says in his Book as can be, whatever he may say in his Book of the Lord's-day, which I have not; but I know 'twas writ a great many Years before his *Methodus* and *Annotations*; because after 'twas writ, he prefix'd to a Book about the Lord's-day an Epistle to the Reader, in 1671. in which Epistle he highly commends this Book, which hath several things very contrary to what Mr. *H---t* hath advanced, which made me less solicitous to enquire after Mr. *Baxter's* Book on the Lord's-day, to see whether he had been fairly dealt with by Mr. *H---t*.

Mr. *H---t* indeed, in his Letter to me, says that he seriously declar'd he meant no more than what the Words quoted by him from Mr. *Baxter* do plainly and necessarily mean, and that if any of his Expressions were capable of meaning more, he wou'd heartily retract them: I knew they were capable of meaning more, and that they cou'd not be reconcil'd with Mr. *Baxter*, any more than with *Scripture*; but I knew also, that a *private Retraction* was not sufficient. Mr. *H---t's* Book was gone abroad, given *Offense* to some, done *Mischief*, as I was told, to others; and therefore I thought it necessary to provoke him to account for his dangerous Expressions more publicly; and therefore, seeing he hath not been able, or thought fit to justify them, why hath he not (according to his Promise) retracted them; I mean, more *fairly* and *explicitely*, and own'd as well that his *Expressions* were odd, as that *his Meaning* was good? If Mr. *H---t* had done this, he had acted ingenuously; but indeed, I cou'd have no great Reason to expect it, when I saw with what *Airs* of *Haughtiness* and *Imperiousness* his Letter was writ, and that it discover'd so much of a *Temper* that will never yield much to *Retraction*. I thought Mr. *H---t* had more Prudence, than to discover himself so plainly to the World by printing such a Letter, which can no way help his Cause, that I see, unless any are satisfy'd thereby, that however dangerous to *Morality* many of his Expressions were, he had no Meanings in them but what were good.

I did not charge Mr. *H---t* with having a particular *Pique* against the first Commandment, but only said, If he had, &c. (which I did not know but he might, as well as one that seem'd to be in his Sentiments, I mean, the Author of an
Appeal

Appeal to a *Turk* or an *Indian*) and therefore, I believe, scarce any one but the charitable Mr. H---t wou'd have advanced a Charge of downright Scandal and Slander, as p. 19. upon such a Foundation: But 'tis very extraordinary what Mr. H---t says after this Charge, viz. " That he does not " think that any Part of Scripture more directly and demon- " strably over-turns my Doctrine (I suppose by what follows he must mean the Doctrine of the Trinity) " than the Doc- " trine of the first Commandment does. " I am very glad Mr. H---t owns, that there is no Text more formidable than this; for if there be not, I hope the Doctrine is very safe: For, whatever Mr. H---t may, I can't think, that there is such a *wonderful* Weight in that Word *Me*, (which Mr. H---t wou'd have me to mind) as to amount to any *probable Proof*, and much less to *Demonstration*; and to satisfy him that it doth not, I refer him to what I have already said about the *Personal Characters*, *I, Us, &c.* Mr. H---t says, p. 20. " that I am known to hold, that the Father, " Son, and Holy Ghost are three Spirits." But I assure Mr. H---t, that this can't be known of me, for I never held it. What Mr. H---t says in the next Paragraph, as taken from my Defence of the Assembly, I own: But the Interpretation that he puts upon it I disown. And whereas he says, " that he hath been assur'd by one who hath talk'd " much with me on this Head, that this is my Opinion;" I must take the Liberty to say, that the *Gentleman*, whoever he was, must be mistaken, if he gave Mr. H---t such Assurance. Mr. H---t, I know, hath been assur'd by one to whom he wrote, that I was no *Sabellian*, and that he cou'd not justly attack me upon that Head, as he design'd: But this *Gentleman* said nothing about what Mr. H---t mentions as my Opinion; and Mr. H---t himself hath, I find, assur'd him, that he is not the Person whom he speaks of, p. 20. Perhaps therefore Mr. H---t's Assurance may be an *Inference* of his own, That I must be a *Tritheist*, because he hath been told I am no *Sabellian*: But if Mr. H---t's Assurance amounts to more than this, I may be pretty confident, I believe, that it is no more than *Hear-say*; for why else shou'd he write to one with whom I have been very intimate, to be inform'd whether 'twas true. But let this be as it will, if it may be to Mr. H---t's, or any one's Satisfaction, to know my Opinion, it is, That the *Father* is *truly* and *properly* *God*; and that our *Saviour*, and the *Holy Ghost*, are each of them *truly* and *properly* *God*; and that these three are *One God*. This was the Sense of the *Assembly*, and this is mine. Nice Explications I have always most carefully

carefully avoided; as sensible that tho' the Doctrine is most true, and that the *Godhead* of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, may be undeniably prov'd from Scripture, yet we should unavoidably run our selves into many Difficulties by such Explications. The Explications that always pleas'd me best, are these of the *first Article* of the Church of *England*, and that in the Assembly's Catechisin, and therefore I am sure I don't differ from the Majority of our Assembly; so that what Mr. H---t says, p. 20. of their having (according to my Opinion) two thirds of the Guilt of *Atheism* in them, &c. I take to be no other than *wild* and *extravagant Talk*, and such as can't deserve the least Regard. Both they, and I, do firmly believe, that there is a God, and that there is but one God; and therefore it wou'd be very strange if the first Commandment shou'd over-turn my Doctrine. And 'tis no less strange, if it shou'd not over-turn Mr. H---t's: for he says, p. 34. "We think it our Duty to worship Christ, &c." But how can he venture to worship him with that religious Worship that he there speaks of, and yet deny his Godhead, or say, that he is not that God that we are required to own or worship by the first Commandment? Is not this to set up one as God that is not (according to Mr. H---t) the Living and True God? And how then can there be a more direct and plain Violation of this Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*? I may therefore venture to say in my Turn, and that upon a much better Foundation than Mr. H---t cou'd, That this Commandment doth directly over-turn Mr. H---t's Doctrine; and therefore, if it be not abolish'd, Mr. H---t will never be able to excuse his Worship of our Blessed Saviour, when he won't allow him to be that God that is spoken of in the first Commandment.

Mr. H---t says, p. 20. "that 'tis wilful Calumny in me to compare him with *Simon Magus*, the Author of the *Fable of the Bees*, &c." But is not the Doctrine that I was opposing too near a-kin (which was my Expression) to that of *Simon Magus*, *Marcion*, *Manes*? If it was not, Mr. H---t shou'd have shewn that I was mistaken, before he had call'd it Wilful Calumny; but where's the Calumny, except in Mr. H---t, when I say nothing but what is true? But this Language is become so familiar to him, that it passeth for very little with me; and will I believe, for the future, meet with the like Disregard from most others. But what Comparison do I make between him and the Author of the *Fable of the Bees*? That which I said was, that I did not doubt, but that he wou'd be ready to say, with this noted

Author, That he had no Design to encourage *Profaneness*; I never say that he had; but there say, That whatever an Author's Design may be in writing Books, he shou'd be very cautious how he writes: I hope there is no Hurt in this; and what signifies it, what the Designs of an Author be, if his Expressions have a dangerous Tendency, as I have made it clear Mr. *H---t*'s have?

Mr. *H---t* says, same Page, " I know it to be false, " when I say, that he attempts to raze the ten Commandments out of the Bible;" but what is it less, when Mr. *H---t* says they are abolish'd, that they don't oblige Christians, and cease to be a Rule to the Church of God? As to the other Part of the Paragraph, *p.* 21. which relates to the Mischief that Mr. *H---t*'s Notions are likely to do to *Natural Religion*, I had Occasion to take Notice of it before, and am not conscious of any Wickedness in saying as I did; and Mr. *H---t* now finds, that I am not *singular* in my Sentiments.

Whether I differ from Mr. *H---t* or not, (which he says, *p.* 21. I do not) I shou'd not however have ventur'd to talk of the Laws of God as Mr. *H---t* doth. We differ, I am sure, very much in Expression, and I think I take Words according to their usual Signification: But if Mr. *H---t*'s Words do want a *new Dictionary* to explain their Meaning, 'tis possible, I confess, that we may then differ and agree at the same time. Nor do I see how it cou'd be upon any other account than this, that Mr. *H---t* shou'd say, *p.* 22. " that I have, *p.* 90. given up the whole of the Dispute to " him." I desire that *p.* 90, and 91. may be consulted, and then every one will see, that the Way in which I have given up the whole Dispute to Mr. *H---t*, is by offering things that he can never answer. Mr. *H---t* says, " that none of " the ten Commandments oblige Christians." I urge there, that the fifth Command (according to Mr. *Baxter*'s Phrase) is recited *preceptively*, and urged upon Christians, as that which must be observ'd by them, &c. This is my way of giving up the whole of the Dispute to Mr. *H---t*, and yielding all that he had been contending for. But certainly every one must see, that Mr. *H---t* boasts of a Victory that is only *imaginary*; and I can hardly suspect his own Sense so much, as to imagine, that he thinks this to be any other than a *flourish*, which perhaps wou'd not have been made, if what I offer wou'd have admitted of a fair Answer: But thus I am frequently trifled with; and therefore 'tis very idle (to say no worse) to talk of " my heinous Wickedness, " and to call me to repent of my abusive *Invectives*, and
" malicious

"malicious Harangues, the like to which he never read before." I am very apt to believe, that most will think that he ought to have excepted his own Pamphlet. But let this be as it will; such Expressions coming from Mr. H---t, to whom they are so natural, will, I dare say, do me no Prejudice: But if Mr. H---t hath any Thought of being accountable for his Words, I think he ought not to give himself such *unaccountable Liberties*. Mr. H---t may laugh at this, as he does at what I say next; and 'tis well if he doth not come to laugh at every thing in a little time.

Mr. H---t is pleas'd (according to his very common Civility) to make a Jest of what I say about the fourth Commandment, p. 73. but perhaps it may appear, when I publish my Discourses on the fourth Commandment, that Mr. H---t laughs at something that he does not seem to understand. He wou'd not, I believe, a little rejoice, if I shou'd expose my self to Ridicule: But for the present, I only assure him, that nothing that he says will in the least discourage me from going on with my *Design*, in which I am (notwithstanding what he says) perswaded I shou'd have his utmost Encouragement, if he thought it wou'd in any measure weaken my Reputation.

Mr. H---t's Assertion that I was considering, p. 74, 75. of my *Preservative*, was, "That the Commandments of the Old Testament were given to the *Jews*, and them only." This Mr. H---t, I presume, found was not defensible, and therefore now contents himself to slide over what I offer against this extravagant Assertion from several Places of Scripture, p. 75, 124, 125. And instead of saying any thing to these Texts, so directly contrary to what he had advanced, he falls to his old and more easy Method of *Carping* and *Raillery*, p. 23. And how desperate must his Cause immediately be, if this was not call'd in at a *dead Lift*, to supply his want of Argument? I'll venture to appeal to all Men of *Sense* and *Temper*, whether the Assertions of Scripture that I quote and urge, and that of Mr. H---t that I was opposing, be not as contrary to each other as Light and Darkness? And when I had mention'd so many things from the *Old Testament*, as urged by the Apostles upon Christians, in the *New*, had I not too much Reason to say, that the Apostle was of Opinion, tho' Mr. H---t be not, that *what was written aforetime, &c. i. e.* (as any Person of Sense and Candour must understand it) concerning the Commandments of the Old Testament. These Mr. H---t says were given to the *Jews*, and them only: But the Apostle says quite the contrary. And therefore how idle is it (when I

was speaking of the Commandments) for Mr. H---t to tell me, " That he had said, and I quoted, that the Old Testament was of use to teach Christians God's Attributes, &c.?" This is nothing to the Argument that I was upon. And what then must the World think of Mr. H---t's Charges of direct Falshood; and that I knew it to be false when I wrote it? p. 23. But Mr. H---t says, p. 24. " I know, he teacheth Mr. P---ce's Catechism, and therefore that *all Scripture is given by Inspiration, &c.* The more culpable therefore is it in him, to cashier all the Laws and Promises of the Old Testament, as things in which Christians have no Concern. The Apostles, I must believe, wou'd never have urged the Laws and Promises of the Old Testament as they do, if they had not a much greater Veneration for them than Mr. H---t's Assertions wou'd allow me to believe he had. Mr. H---t, in this same p. 24. charges me with a gross Forgery, for saying that the Old Testament is of no other Use to Christians, &c. and for my Conviction (no doubt) speaks concerning his Exposition of the fourth Answer of Mr. P---ce's Catechism. This perhaps may be as wonderful as his *Specimen* that he hath publish'd; but I can't tell what it is, and perhaps never shall; and I dare say 'twill be no great Loss whether I do or no. But if Mr. H---t had quoted me *fairly*, which he shou'd have been very careful to do, when he was managing a *Charge of Forgery* against me, I shou'd, I believe, (with all Persons of Temper) have been excused from the Charge. That which I say, p. 122. is, that Mr. H---t says in *effect*, in pursuance of these very odd and false Assertions (*i. e.* That the Commands of the Old Testament were peculiarly given to the *Jews*, and that the Promises of the Old Testament were peculiarly made to the *Jews*) That the Old Testament is of no other Use to Christians, &c. and does what he says afterwards prove that they are of any other use, than to understand those things which he had before mentioned, and are referr'd to in the New? What is it besides that the Old Testament (which he himself had cashier'd its Laws and Promises) helps us to understand? Mr. H---t (I am apt to think) must see, that this is what I intended, and therefore leaves out these Words, *Mr. H---t says in effect*; which plainly implies, that I allow'd he had said something more, but nothing to the Purpose. And therefore to charge me, " with a glaring Instance of downright Forgery, " and that he shall be able to take my Word for nothing;" when he had no better Foundation for such *outrageous Expressions*, is not, I am sure, to speak or write as one who thinks, *that for every idle or reproachful Word that Men shall speak,*
they

they must give an Account thereof in the Day of Judgment. A good Cause needs no such unchristian Rage, and a bad one can never be better'd by it.

Mr. H---t, p. 25. finds fault (I think causelessly) with the Translation of *Mat. v. 39.* and therefore renders *ἐπιβὰν τοῖς ἀγχαίοις*, *It hath been said to them of old time*, instead of, *by them of old time.* I allow, the Greek will warrant his rendering, and so also it will our Translation; but I can by no means allow what he seems to aim at by this Translation, viz. That Christ doth here give a new Law: For 'tis evident that Christ, in this Chapter, was giving the true Sense of the old Law, which the Scribes had so wretchedly corrupted and perverted by their *false Glosses.*

I take it as wonderful in Mr. H---t, that he shou'd be able to write two short Paragraphs, in p. 25. without Railing: But he very soon returns, in the same Page, to his old Work of charging me with "Maliciousness, Impertinence, and direct, known, wilful Falshood." I hope he won't be offended, if I tell him, That such perpetual harping upon one String, makes it extremely dull and nauseous. But why shou'd it be thought malicious to speak as I do, when Mr. H---t says, as I quote him, p. 80, 81. "That it can't be thought, that God spake these Ten to the People with his own Voice, to imply, that these were of a more exalted and extraordinary Nature, than the rest of the Commands which he had to give them?" I endeavour'd to prove that they were; which Mr. H---t, for a very good Reason, hath not answer'd: But to make good his Charge, he says he expressly call'd the Command, to love God with all the Heart, the greatest of all the Commandments. Very true, he doth say so: But I had told him, that this is imply'd, I think, tho' not express'd, in the Commands of the first Table; so that, if there be any Meaning in Words, they were the Ten Commandments, and this among the rest, which was imply'd in some of them of which Mr. H---t says, that God did not intend to imply, that they were of a more exalted and extraordinary Nature than the rest; i. e. as any one wou'd understand it, the *Ceremonial Law.* So that if Mr. H---t won't express himself a little more cautiously, and so as that he can't be understood, unless we understand his secret Meanings as well as Words, I humbly hope that the most will excuse me from Malice, Impertinence, and known, direct, wilful Falshood, in speaking as I do. And I must leave it to the World to think as well as they can of Mr. H---t, who deals so much in *Charges* of this Nature, without having any thing suitable to support them.

When I say, *p.* 84. how daring it is to tell what God wou'd have done, or not have done, Mr. *H---t* says, *p.* 25. "that 'tis plain he hath not." What then is the Meaning of Mr. *H---t*'s Words, *p.* 158 ? *viz.* "That the Distinction was made by the People, and that if the People had complain'd, when only *five* Commands had been deliver'd, I suppose, God wou'd have desisted from speaking, when the *five* were pronounced: or if the People had borne the Terror longer, God wou'd have proceeded to publish *twelve, fourteen, or any other Number, in the same manner.*" What Meaning can Words have, if this be not to tell what God wou'd, or wou'd not have done? I have not yet met with one Person that has seen Mr. *H---t*'s Book, but understands these Words just as I do. And as to what Mr. *H---t* says farther, *p.* 26. I shall only say, That I am far from thinking that *Moses* contradicted himself; but am forced to differ from Mr. *H---t* about the exact Order of the Accounts in *Exodus* and *Deuteronomy*. My own Opinion is, that they are more concise in the former; but more plain, and regularly placed, and related with greater *Distinction, Order, and Exactness*, in the latter. And that the *Fathers* and other *Divines* have thought so as well as I, is plain from their Opinion, *viz.* That God gave the Ceremonial Law after the *Jews* had fallen into Idolatry, to restrain them from the like Practice for the future. And I flatter my self with this Persuasion, that there's scarce any unprejudiced Person, but will think of this Matter as others have done, and I do. If I thought that God had said otherwise, I shou'd very freely have chosen to take God's own Word by *Moses*; and this is what I must think I do.

Mr. *H---t* is forced to own, *p.* 28. That my Sense of the Word *Pædagogue* was right, and his from *Terence* defective. What Occasion then cou'd there be for Mr. *H---t*'s pretty Turn, "if others will laugh at this, I can only pity you, but "I can't help it." 'Tis a little odd, that I shou'd deserve Pity for being in the right: But this is very gentle Usage to what I have been used to from Mr. *H---t*; and therefore I pass it over, and leave others to laugh or pity, as they see Occasion; only minding Mr. *H---t* once more, that he ought, I think, to have shewn a little more Compassion to his *nine poor Arguments*, and not have left them in such a *naked and defenceless Posture* as he hath done, to the Care of Mr. *Baxter*, who, long since his Book upon the Lord's-day was written, hath spoken very differently of the ten Commandments from what Mr. *H---t* hath done, whatever he may say in that Book. But of this before.

In p. 28. Mr. H---t says, " I say the vilest Things of Mr. P---ce." But this is Mr. H---t's great Mistake, I fairly quote what Mr. H---t says of him. And if he hath represented him wrongly, I can't help it. Mr. H---t's Representation of him gave just Occasion for every thing I say. 'Tis too hard by far (unless Mr. H---t cou'd pretend to search the Heart) so much as to suggest, as p. 29. that I had any *Malice*, and much less a *determined Malice* against Mr. P---ce. I ever had, I own, an utter Aversion to his *Notions*, but never any to his *Person*. I hope, I can rejoice, when others outshine me. And if Mr. P---ce had done it never so much, he wou'd never have been the Object of my *Envy*, but *Pleasure*. But if Mr. P---ce had been the greatest Man that ever liv'd, I wou'd have opposed him (according to my best Abilities) if I thought he opposed the Gospel, and attempted to rob the Redeemer of his *highest Honour*, and Believers of their *greatest Comfort and Security*. 'Tis *idle*, and *perfectly groundless Talk* to say, that I threaten'd to equal Mr. P---ce as a learned Writer. I desire to be thankful for any thing that God hath given me, how mean soever, and hope shall endeavour to be as useful with what I have, as I can. I know I have nothing *but what I have received*, and don't know that I ever boasted, as I myself have heard a dear Friend of Mr. H---t's to do; if I have, 'tis my Fault, and I desire to be humble for it: Nor did I ever, that I know, speak of others, as others have of me; I scorn the *mean Practice*, and shou'd think it a Disparagement to my Character. 'Tis very little to me, what some may think of him, or me. If at any time I collect what learned Men have already written; 'tis no more than what greater Men than I, or even Mr. H---t can pretend to be, have done; and whenever I do it, I don't take the Honour of it to myself; but refer to my Author, and not do, as one well known to Mr. H---t is said to do, transcribe other Persons Papers, and publish them as my own. I hope, I study the Scriptures, and have Charity to think (whatever Mr. H---t says to the contrary, p. 29.) that a great many *Divines* do the same. What vast Discoveries Mr. P---ce may have made, I can't say: But what is yet published, can never deserve the *pompous Character* Mr. H---t gives them; and some of them, I think, deserve the *Abhorrence*, rather than the *Applause* of Mankind. What Pleasure Mr. H---t might take in a little *selfsome Applause*, I can't say; all I am apt to believe, have more than they deserve: But I desire, that my greatest Pleasure may always be, to be useful in the World; and if in order hereto, God be pleased to make
me

me acceptable, 'twill, I hope, give me a *grateful*, and not a *vain* and *fantastick Satisfaction*. And 'twou'd, I am sure, have been a great Satisfaction to me, if Mr. P---ce instead of employing his valuable Parts and Learning to undermine what I think to be essential to Religion, had employed them to support its Interest in the World.

What Pleasure it may give Mr. H---t to tell the little Story he mentions, p. 19. I don't know: But, I assure him, it never gave me the least Uneasiness. He says, "he was told it from a learned and ingenious Man, who was often forced to hear me." If I am not mistaken in the Person, as I apprehend I am not, I must beg leave to suspect the *Truth*, or the *fair Relation* of it, because so very contrary to what he hath told me and several others: But if it be never so true, what Wonder is it, that I shou'd be thus spoken of, when this or the like is the *common Compliment* that many are pleased to bestow on such as are not in the same Notions with them? yea, when they are come to speak of the Writings of such eminent Persons as Dr. Manton, Dr. Bates, and Mr. Baxter, &c. (Persons to whom I han't the Vanity to compare myself) as no better than the Productions of *old Women*. Whatever therefore I may venture to publish, one such *pretty, polite saying*, of a learned and ingenious Man, won't in the least discourage me.

Mr. H---t, p. 30. in answer to what I say on his Chapter about catechising, takes his old Method, leaves the greatest Part unanswer'd, picks out a *Scrap* or *two*, where he thinks he hath an Advantage, discharges some of his *Choler*, in *reproachful Expressions*, and then, *triumphantly* shuts up the *wonderful Performance*. As to his *Specimen* of catechising, he says, "He is not afraid to leave it to speak for itself." All this may be, and yet it may speak but little to its Author's Honour, or very little to the Purpose, and this, I think, I have sufficiently manifested in 8 or 9 Pages, to which if Mr. H---t had any thing considerable to object, his *poor Specimen*, like other Parts of his Book wou'd not have been so unkindly left to shift for itself.

But says Mr. H---t, "you directly and wilfully falsify, when you tell the World, that I say, Christians have no Concern with the Laws, Promises, and Threatnings of the Old Testament." I wou'd fain know, what Mr. H---t says less, p. 161, 162, 177. But he tells me, that in his Letter to Mr. Fowler he said so and so. How happy is it for Mr. H---t that he hath so many good Meanings, when he hath so many very odd and dangerous Expressions? I have told him already, why I take the Controversy between

tween him and Mr. *Vowler* as nothing to the Dispute between him and me: But however, how can it be true what Mr. *H---t* says, p. 161, 162. "That if He [*i. e.* God] had intended, that the *Gentile* World shou'd observe the same ten Commandments, he wou'd have revealed his Will to them in this Respect; and that unless these ten Commandments had been published a second Time with a new Preface directed to other People, besides those, whom *Moses* conducted out of *Egypt*, it will not be easy to imagine, that the ten Commandments were designed to oblige any others?" But 'tis very plain, that God did intend, that the *Gentile* World shou'd obey the same ten Commandments, and therefore, they are urged upon Christians (as I have largely prov'd) in the New Testament. And here, I can't see, what help he can have from his *Metaphysical quatenus*, or *as such*. And what a poor Shift is it to say, that he had used the Word *Testament* instead of *Covenant*? For was he not speaking of all the Scriptures, p. 176? Does he not tell us, "That the Scriptures were found in the Bible?" Does he not tell us, "That the Bible is divided into two Parts, and that these Parts are the Old and New Testament, or rather the Old and New Covenant," and after all this, usher in the Expressions that I object against? And now, *all of a sudden*, the whole Old Testament, or Covenant, which he had been speaking of must signify only a Part of the Old Testament. At this rate of Management, Mr. *H---t* may write what he will, and no one must venture to write against him, lest in his most offensive Expressions he shou'd have a good Meaning, and such a Meaning, as the Words by the most charitable Construction can never bear, without making downright Nonsense of the whole Discourse. Farther, if the Old Testament signifies a Part of the Old Testament only, why mayn't the New signify a Part of the New? Besides, there is one Thing more that Mr. *H---t* shou'd have consider'd, *viz.* that God's Covenant with the *Jews* was for Substance the same that it was with *Abraham*; and that it is with us. I know therefore no Rules of Morality that I have transgressed in writing against Mr. *H---t*, (I wish he cou'd as truly say the same) nor am I at all apprehensive, that any of such good Sense as my Brethren are, will condemn me for it.

I urge several Promises besides these relating to the *Messiah*, and that *Gal. iii. 6, &c.* which were made to the *Jews*, and which Mr. *H---t* says were peculiar to them; which yet I prove to belong to Christians, and that they are given

them in the New Testament for their Encouragement. If they don't, why had not Mr. H---t answer'd what I say, instead of putting me off with saying something of *Prophecies*, which was not the Thing I was directly speaking about? Wou'd it not have been more ingenuous for Mr. H---t to own, that he was mistaken, than to make a shew of answering in such a way as this?

But says Mr. H---t, *p.* 31. " You go on in your old " way of Impertinence and Falshood, *p.* 128." But was it not Mr. H---t's Part (if he had been a fair Disputant) to make good this Charge? To vindicate himself from being impertinent, and to answer what I say in the Page he quotes? I dare say, that none, even the most prejudiced in his Favour, can think he hath done it, and where then must these Charges fix?

Mr. H---t in replying to what I say about Mr. P---ce's Catechism, *p.* 130. says, " it is not intelligible to him;" for, says he, " I thought the Scriptures were fully as well " adapted to inform the Judgment as any Writings of Men." Mr. H---t knows, I say in this Page, that the Scripture-Expressions can't be objected against; that I commend a *Catechism* that hath Scripture Proofs, to which I'll add, that I admire the Scriptures: But yet Mr. H---t (as well as I) takes it upon him to explain them, and, I suppose, with a Design to inform the Judgments of his Hearers. And I am very glad, if upon that concerning Subject of *Repentance*, he hath discharged the Part of a *Catechist*, as well as he says; but what he hath done so well as a *Catechist*, is done to his hand in the *Assembly's Catechism*, with proper References to the Scripture, and therefore I prefer this which was done by so many *wise, great, and good Men* to the Performance of any one particular *Catechist* whatsoever. One great Thing I find fault with Mr. P---ce's Catechism for, is the *artful Contrivance* of the Questions. To this, I observe Mr. H---t hath nothing to say, which makes me think, he is convinced my Remark was just.

Mr. H---t says, *p.* 32. " That I am unhappy as to the " Charge of Omissions which I advance against this Catechism." If I am, Mr. H---t, I must think, is no less unhappy in proving it, and in pretending to find a Covenant in these Words, *so God created Man in his own Image*, and so likewise is he in the other Scripture written in the Margin. The *Assembly's Catechism* wou'd have helped him here by the Scripture that it refers to, *viz.* *Gen.* ii. 17. here a Covenant is fairly implied. And who, besides Mr. H---t, wou'd say as in the following Words, that it shou'd be ridiculous

diculous in me to speak, what he himself knows to be true? And how can Mr. *H---t* say in the same Page, that this Catechism was design'd to be truly *Catholick*, when it is so apparently contriv'd to promote that *Set of Notions* that Mr. *P---ce* had taken up. *Arians*, for ought I know, may think they deserve the Name of *Catholicks* as well as the *Papists*. What my own Sentiments are, is pretty well known, and I was never ashamed to own them. However, I'll say, that a *Catechism* form'd upon a *Calvinistical Scheme* is, in my Opinion, a thousand times better than one form'd upon an *Arian Scheme*, as Mr. *P---ce*'s most evidently is. Mr. *H---t* says, "the learned World wou'd have thought odly of Mr. *P---ce*, if according to my Desire he had proved Original Sin from these Words of the Apostle, *and were by nature Children of Wrath.*" But with what face can Mr. *H---t* say, this was my Desire, when I quote the Text, not to prove *Original Sin*, (which yet is one of our great natural Infelicities) but more largely our Misery by Nature; but then, wou'd any in the learned World, besides *Socinians*, *Arminians*, &c. of this Stamp, have thought odly of Mr. *P---ce*, if he had proved Original Sin from those other Texts I mentioned, *viz. that we are shapen in Iniquity, and conceived in Sin?* and that *the carnal Mind* (which is the Mind of all as they come into the World) *is Enmity against God?* and that *a Man must be born again*, which takes in, I think, Infants as well as others, *if he wou'd see the Kingdom of God?* I can't so well see, what Reference that Text hath to our Misery by Nature, *all have sinned*, &c. this shews, what our Case is, and how much we need a Saviour: But whether this was our Condition by Nature, or not, it doth not say. Mr. *H---t* therefore shou'd not have trifled after this rate; but fairly own'd, that this was an Omission, or that it was Mr. *P---ce*'s Opinion, that there's no such thing as *Original Sin*. Mr. *H---t* is far from making it clear, that my Charge of Omissions thus far forth was not a very just and righteous Charge. And I wish Mr. *H---t*, for his own sake, had seriously consider'd what he says in the Close of this Paragraph, *viz. "That Christ will come with ten thousand of his holy Angels to punish the malicious and false Accusers;"* for if he had, it must have given some Check to that Spirit of *Raillery* and *Calumny* that runs thro' his whole Performance. *Malice* I won't charge him with, because I can't look into his Heart: But yet I can't but be afraid, that *out of the Abundance of his Heart* he hath given himself the Liberty to write as he doth.

I own, that I blame the Catechism for attempting to rob

our Saviour and Sanctifier of their highest Glory. And for allowing none but the Father to be the one God. Mr. H---t can't say, but the Charge (as I intended it) was just, and I beg leave to tell him, that it neither becomes him or me to banter, as *p. 33.* where the Subject is so *awful*. However, I can see nothing in the Text mentioned to prove what it is brought for: For as it will not follow, that the Father is not the Lord of Christians, because 'tis said in the same Verse, *there is but one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all Things, and we by him*; so neither will it, that Christ is not the God of Christians, because 'tis said, *that to us, there is but one God the Father*. They are both *Lord*, and both *God*; and methinks, 'tis undeniable, that the Apostle thought thus of Christ, because he says of him, *that by him are all things*, which undeniably shews, that he is God, *Heb. iii. 4. Rom. i. 20.* And what if Mr. P---ce cou'd not find it in one Text, that the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* are the *one God*, it won't follow, but this Truth may be found in several Texts brought and compar'd together, and that's sufficient. And even what's tantamount to this, may, I think, be found in one Text, *viz. 1 John v. 7. There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*; One what, if not one *Divine Substance*, or *one God*. Mr. H---t says, Mr. P---ce hath actually inserted, *John i. 1. In the Beginning, &c. i. e.* a Text which he thought, 'tis likely, might be easily answer'd, tho' I think otherwise; and he hath omitted several others, on which a very great Stress is laid; and tho' he hath inserted this, yet methinks 'tis plain, that it cou'd be only to amuse, and not to prove, that Christ is *God in a proper Sense*; because in this Sense (according to him) the *Father only* is so. Mr. H---t says, Mr. P---ce wou'd have added a Text in which the Holy Ghost is called God, if he had thought there were any such in the Bible. I thank Mr. H---t, that he hath so plainly told us what Mr. P---ce's Thoughts were: But is there really no such Text to be found? I can't but think that is one, *Acts v. 4. Thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God, i. e.* to the *Holy Ghost*, as the Apostle himself had said before. Farther, I think, that's another, *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, 2 Tim. iii. 16. i. e.* as is evident from the *Act of Inspiration*, the *Holy Ghost*. Farther, Believers are said to be the *Temple of God, i. e.* the *Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. iii. 16. 1 Cor. vi. 19.* compar'd. And now let Mr. H---t himself judge, whether some or all of these Texts don't as fully and plainly prove that the *Holy Ghost* is God, as a Multitude of
these

these Texts that are brought by Mr. P---ce in his Catechism, do prove the things that they are brought to prove. And wou'd not Mr. P---ce have added one or other of these, or some other to the same Purpose, if he had not attempted (as I say) in his Catechism to rob our *Glorious Sanctifier* of his highest Glory? If a Catechism deserves such Commendation, that hath a designed Omission so gross, and of such ill Consequence to the Souls of Men, may the Church of God never take up, say I, with such a Catechism, and I humbly hope God will never suffer it so to be.

Mr. H---t says, p. 33. "that my next Charge is the most extraordinary of all, p. 133. where I say, this Catechism says nothing about the Worship of Christ." But is it fair in Mr. H---t to take only a part of my Words, and to tack a Sense to them that he might see (if he had read and consider'd the whole Passage) cou'd never be intended. That which I blam'd Mr. P---ce, &c. for, was, that tho' Christ be represented as the *Great Object of Religious Worship and Adoration*, that they had shamefully quibbled and kept upon the *Reserve* as to this important Affair. So that all that I cou'd by any reasonable and candid Construction be thought to intend was, that Mr. P---ce had spoken nothing plainly and properly about the Worship of Christ, and accordingly, I express my self thus; Is it not surprizing, that when the Scriptures speak so much concerning the Worship of Christ, in the *strictest* and most *proper Sense*, that this *famous* Catechism shou'd say nothing about it? *i. e.* as any one who is not intollerably captious wou'd take it, in this *strictest* and most *proper Sense*. I knew very well what Mr. P---ce had said, and what Texts he had put down in his Catechism; but then, he doth not tell us whether he understands them of *proper Worship*, or not. And this remarkable Shyness and Reservedness of Mr. P---ce, in forming his Questions (wherein all the wrong Notions in his Catechism are convey'd) in so important an Affair as the Worship of Christ, looks at least (to use the Words of a very learned Writer against Dr. Clark, upon the same Subject*) as if the Intent was, to throw off the Worship of our blessed Saviour. 'Tis, I think, very well worth Observation, that Dr. Clark, upon the Head of Worship, useth two of the same Texts that Mr. P---ce doth in his Catechism, *viz. Heb. i. 6. Philip. ii. 10, 11.* and yet he says, when speaking of Worship, "Every thing is faulty in this kind, besides the Worship of him *alone*, who created the World by his Power, who redeem'd Mankind

* Remarks upon Dr. Clark's Exposit. &c. p. 8.

“ by his Son, and who sanctifies all good Persons by his “ Holy Spirit.” And what is this but saying, (says the Author of the *Remarks* †) that all religious Worship is faulty except the Worship of the Father only? And how cou’d I think, but this also was Mr. P---ce’s Opinion, when I knew how he expounded *Heb. i. 6. Philip. ii. 8, 9, 10, 11?* And what I suppos’d, and am now certain he said about Worship, in Reply to my Pamphlet, *Truth and Liberty consistent, &c. p. 68, 84.* Mr. P---ce’s quoting some Texts that relate to the Worship of Christ, and putting such a Sense upon them as shews (according to him) that they don’t signify any *proper Worship*, is all *Amusement*, or, as I said, *Quibbling*, and saying nothing. And that this is the Case is very plain, for on that Text, *Heb. i. 6. Let all the Angels of God worship him*, his Paraphrase and Notes are, “ Let all the Angels “ of God be subject to him. That he [*i. e.* God] never spake “ to the Angels as he did to him, but instead of that, that “ is, at his Resurrection, he commanded the Angels to be “ subject to him.” According to Mr. P---ce therefore, these Words can have no Reference to us, or our Worship (about which I was speaking) but to the Angels, who before Christ’s Resurrection, had their distinct Governments, but were all at his Resurrection resign’d to him, and what is this (tho’ repeated in Mr. P---ce’s Catechism) to the Worship of Christians? But farther, to let us see more what Mr. P---ce’s Sense of this Text was, he plainly intimates, that the Worship spoken of therein was not due to Christ till after his Resurrection; the World that Christ is said in this Verse to be brought into (according to Mr. P---ce) “ commenced at “ Christ’s Resurrection, there being then an entire Change “ made in the State and Government of the World; Christ “ had at his Resurrection, says he, a more excellent Authority conferr’d upon him, than can be pretended to belong “ to any of the Angels*.” Can Mr. H---t say, that there is any thing in this relating to that *strict* and *proper Worship* that I spake of? Mr. P---ce’s Paraphrase and Notes on *Phil. ii. 8, &c.* are much to the same Purpose. His Words are, “ Upon this account God hath advanced him higher than “ before, and freely bestow’d on him Authority that is superior to what he ever granted to another, That by vertue of “ the Authority of Jesus, all shou’d be constrain’d to submit to God, whether they are heavenly or earthly Beings, “ or such as are under the Earth, and that every Tongue “ shou’d acknowledge, that Jesus Christ is by this Gift of

† *Ibid. p. 5, 6.*

* Mr. P---ce on the Hebrews.

“ God,

“ God, Lord of all, to the Glory of God the Father.” Farther he says, as before on the *Hebrews*, “ That at Christ’s Resurrection an entire Change was made in this State of Things, and an End was put to this Rule of Angels ; they themselves, together with all Nations, were put under this Head, even Christ ; whose Authority and Power was then so highly advanced above what it was before, he being entrusted with a universal Dominion, and all that were Rulers or Governours before being made his Subjects and Ministers †.” I wou’d ask any sober Person, whether this be not *fine Divinity* ? Whether Mankind is likely to be the better for these *surprizing Discoveries* ? And, How much this doth relate to the *strict and proper Worship of Christ* ? And who can think any other, but that if he had also expounded *John* v. 22, 23. it wou’d have been to the same Purpose ? And now, I wou’d ask again, What is all this to that *Religious Worship* of which I was treating ? and whether I had not Reason to say, that this Catechism says nothing of the Worship of Christ, nothing *pertinent*, nothing concerning the Worship of Christ in the *strictest and most proper Sense* ; which are my Words ? I was not speaking, as Mr. H---t well knows, of *Civil*, but *Religious Worship* ; not of Worship *more largely* consider’d, but of *strict direct Worship*, as importing *Adoration, Invocation, Thanksgiving, &c.* This Worship I think ought not to be paid to Christ, unless consider’d as *God over all, or the Living and True God*. But to make it plainer, if possible, still, that it was a just Charge I brought against Mr. P---ce’s Catechism, I am ask’d by Mr. P---ce *, “ Where I do find it in Mr. P---ce’s Scheme, that the Son hath *Infinite Perfections, or the Worship, Powers, and Prerogatives* (of the Unbegotten and Supreme) *God* ? “ I am also told that a Difference must be put in the Respect we are to pay to those Persons, [*i. e.* Father, Son, and Holy Ghost] “ and that ’tis the special Relation they [*i. e.* the Son and Holy Ghost] “ bear to God that is the Reason “ of that Respect we pay to them, to the one as the Son, “ and to the other as the Spirit of God ; and that none of “ the Perfections that are peculiar to God are ever ascrib’d “ to our Saviour or the Holy Ghost †. When therefore Mr. H---t knew all this, and cou’d not but be sensible that I knew it too, I venture to leave it with all unprejudiced Persons, whether I have done any Wrong to Mr. P---ce or his Catechism ; and whether I am not treated in a most un-

† Mr. P---ce on *Philip*.

* Reply to *Truth and Liberty*, p. 84.

† Reply to Mr. Enty’s *Truth and Liberty, &c.* p. 68, 71.

christian Manner by Mr. *H---t*, p. 33, 34, when charg'd
 " as promoting *Immorality, Lying, and False-witness* in par-
 " ticular, and represented as being a *common Liar*." If Mr.
H---t can be easy in this, and forgive himself without Re-
 pentance, I wou'd not have his *Conscience* for ten thousand
 Worlds. But says Mr. *H---t*, " These last Words (mean-
 " ing, *Every Tongue shou'd confess that Jesus Christ is Lord*
 " *to the Glory of God the Father*) seem to have dazzled your
 " Eyes so much, that you cou'd see nothing in the Page
 " about the worshiping of Christ, tho' the whole Page is
 " spent about that, and nothing else." But I know no
 Reason why my Eyes shou'd be dazzled with this; because
 there is nothing in it that is in the least contrary to any No-
 tions of mine. I have no Occasion to deny, that the whole
 Concern of our Redemption is to the Glory of the Father;
 'tis what I readily and thankfully own; and 'tis no Dispa-
 ragement at all to *my God and Saviour*, no Signification
 at all of his *Inferiority*, or of his being a *Creature*, that it is
 so. My Eyes were not dazzled with this; but they must
 have been strangely dazzled, if I had seen that which was
 never there, or designed to be there, namely, any thing about
 the Worship of Christ, in the *strictest and most proper Sense*
of Worship.

'Twou'd be besides my Purpose to shew how odd and
 unaccountable, how unscriptural and dangerous, these *Whims*
 and *Fancies* of Mr. *P---ce* are that I have mentioned: But I
 think it became Mr. *H---t* to answer a little otherwise than
 he hath what I have said upon the Head of Worship, and
 not refer me to a Book, *viz. Unity, &c.* which hath so
 long since been answer'd by so great a Master as Dr. *Water-*
land. 'Tis easy to guess the Reason, why Mr. *H---t* doth
 not meddle more with what I have said. The little that he
 says, is in p. 34. here, says Mr. *H---t*, " you take Occa-
 " sion to treat largely on the Head of Worship, p. 135, &c.
 " in which are some things very true, and some things very
 " weak." But I dare say, tho' I hate boasting, that if Mr.
H---t cou'd have pick'd out any of these weak things, he
 wou'd never have been so unfriendly to his Cause, or so un-
 like himself, as not to lay them before the World in the
strongest Colours. " We think it our Duty, says Mr. *H---t*,
 " to worship Christ in all these Ways and Instances in which
 " the Scripture hath directed us to do so, either by Com-
 " mand or Example." But Mr. *H---t*, I think, shou'd
 have answer'd what I say, p. 135, 136, 137, &c. *viz.* that
 there cou'd have been no such Commands or Examples at
 all, if Christ had not been the Living and True God, or if
 it

it be true what Mr. P---ce says, that none of the Perfections that are peculiar to God are ascrib'd to our Saviour or the Holy Ghost. If this be true, all these Instances of Worship that Mr. H---t mentions ought to be dropt; because Religious Worship is, as I prove, always confin'd in Scripture to God. So that 'tis not so much what Mr. H---t doth, as how he can excuse himself from *Idolatry*, if he worships any *besides God*, or *does Service to that which by Nature is no God*. But says Mr. H---t, " We think it the plainest Case in the World, that Christ is fully qualified to hear and answer our Prayers, and to receive our Thanksgivings." This I readily allow, and it can't be deny'd: But then, this undeniably proves against Mr. H---t and Mr. P---ce, that he hath the *Divine Perfections*, and is *truly God*. But farther, says Mr. H---t, " He fully knows all the Creatures he hath made, and all their Actions, Wants, and Thoughts, all their Dangers and Distresses, and, indeed, every thing that can concern them." This (if taken according to the common Sense of Words) will effectually over-turn Mr. H---t's Cause, and allow me all that I have been contending for, in reference to our *Saviour's Omniscience*; and if he hath this, he must have that Divine Nature to which this Attribute belongs. Mr. H---t says, " that all Authority is given him in Heaven and Earth, &c. in consequence of which, it can't but be proper to ask any of these Blessings of him, &c. and to thank him when we have receiv'd them." I allow, that 'tis not only proper, but our *indispensible Duty*: But it cou'd neither have been proper, or our Duty, if *all the Fulness of the Godhead had not dwelt bodily in him*, and render'd him capable of communicating his Fulness to us, and Grace for Grace. And whereas there seems to be a mighty Stress laid on this, *that all Authority is given him, &c.* I answer, that as our Saviour in governing the World acts as *Διευθυντης*, or as *God-Man*; so, I own, it must be by *Grant*, or *Donation*, that the *Manhood*, or *human Nature* of Christ hath any Concern in this Matter. But that our Saviour was able, first to make, and since to uphold and govern, and at last to judge the World, this doth as fully prove that he is God, as that the Creation doth that there is any God at all; which according to the Apostle, *Rom. i. 20.* it undeniably doth. Neither Mr. H---t, nor any of the Writers of his Side, have ever been able to prove, that 'twas by any *given Power*, that our Saviour made, and doth still uphold the World. This was *originally* and *eternally* in him; and were it not so, it cou'd never have been proper, or even lawful, to worship him at all. Mr.

H---t says, " that Christ is qualified for being worship'd as " Mediator." But he cou'd neither have been qualify'd for Worship, or yet to be a Mediator, unless he had been *God over all, blessed for evermore*; and 'tis because he is so, that we are requir'd to worship him now, and that 'twill be our Duty to worship him for *ever*, when his *Mediation is over, and at an end*. Mr. *H---t* says, " That Christ's Qualifications, and God's Command, will prevent all Danger " of Idolatry, provided we worship the Son as Son and Mediator." I allow, that there can be no Danger of Idolatry, if when we consider him as Son and Mediator, we allow him also to be the *True God*; and make his *Godhead* the *Foundation* of our Worship: But if we deny this, as Mr. *H---t* doth, we can't possibly avoid being guilty of this abominable Sin. This I have fully proved, and Mr. *H---t* shou'd have answer'd; and therefore seeing this is not done, I take it to be no other than begging the Question, to speak as Mr. *H---t* doth. And Mr. *H---t*, I hope, will give me leave to tell him, that it looks a little odd on his *Cause*, or *Capacity*, that instead of answering what I have said, he shou'd refer me to Books for an Answer to so many things that I had never offer'd to the World before.

Mr. *H---t*, p. 35. closeth his Paragraph about Worship, by adding, " That the True God, 1 *John* v. 20. is God the " Father; as is demonstrable from these Words, his Son Jesus Christ." 'Twou'd be very much, if these Words shou'd be a Demonstration of the Truth of what Mr. *H---t* says: But I have very often observ'd, that these Books of Demonstration have had nothing in them; and so I must think it is in the present Case. For 'tis plain, I think, as *Glassius* * and Dr. *Whitby* † observe, that the Apostle is here speaking of Christ, and giving us a true Description of him. 'Tis also, I think, very plain, that 'tis Christ of whom the Apostle says, that they were in him. They were by Profession Christ's Disciples. They were planted into Christ by Faith and the Spirit. And then, he immediately adds who this Son of God is that they were in, that they believ'd in, that they were the Disciples of, and planted into, even Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the Person last mention'd, and therefore what follows, *viz.* *This is the True God, and Eternal Life, by a Grammatical and most natural Construction*, must be understood of him. It hath been observ'd long ago by that great and eminent Critick *Glassius* †, that relative and demonstrative Pronouns (such

* *Glass. Philolog. sacra*, p. 516.

† *Glass. Phil. sac. ibid.*

† *Whitby in locum.*

as οὗτος here) do ordinarily and most frequently refer to what immediately foregoes, for the Confirmation of which he produceth several Instances as to the Pronoun οὗτος, viz. *Job*. i. 2, 7, 30. 1 *John* v. 6. 2 *John* v. 9. and perhaps it never happens otherwise, unless there be some Necessity for the contrary, and the Scope of the Words forceth us to it, as it can't (without begging the Question) be pretended it doth in the present Case. For Christ is called *God* by St. *John*, in the Beginning of his Gospel, and represented in the same Place as *that God who made all things*, to distinguish him from all sorts of Creatures, high as well as low. He is also called by this same Apostle, by way of Eminency, ο ἰσχυρός, *the True*, *Rev.* iii. 7. xix. 11. He is also by this Apostle called *Life*, *John* i. 4. And so in this Epistle, chap. i. 2. he is called *Life*, and *Eternal Life*; so that what is said in this Place in one Proposition, is no more than is said in other Places by this Apostle, concerning our Blessed Saviour; there can therefore be nothing like Necessity for referring the Pronoun οὗτος to a remote *Antecedent*, when it so fairly and fully agrees with that which is nearer; so that 'twould be perfectly *ungrammatical* to refer οὗτος to any other Person or thing than Christ Jesus. And besides, there seems to be something considerable in what Dr. *Whitby* observes upon the Place, that to refer *this* to the *True God* going before, makes the Apostle guilty of a *Tautology*, by saying, the True God, he is the True God. And this some of the most considerable Opposers of our Saviour's *Deity* have been sensible of, and therefore have endeavour'd to answer the Words another Way; but yet with no better Success than Mr. *H---* hath. Indeed, we have only Mr. *H---*'s Word, that what he says is Demonstration, or that this Text is exactly parallel to *John* xvii. 3. In one place, the Apostle says the *Father is the True God*; and the same he says of our Saviour in this Place. And tho' this will by no means agree with Mr. *H---*'s Notions, yet I can't so much as question, whether the Apostle knew how to speak consistently.

Mr. *H---* is pleas'd to vindicate his Discourse of saying Grace, p. 35, &c. much after the same manner that he doth his others; that is, by carping at some things I say, and leaving the rest unanswer'd. Against Mr. *H---*'s interpreting of St. *Luke* i. 16. I observ'd, that we are not to interpret St. *Luke* by St. *John*; and one Reason was, that if St. *Luke* by εὐλόγησεν, which is the Word he useth, had meant the same that St. *John* did by εὐχαριστήσας, which is the Word he useth, he wou'd not have said εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς, but εὐχαριστήσας αὐτούς, or ἐπὶ αὐτούς. Mr. *H---* must, I apprehend, be sensible of this Remark

was just, inconsistent with his Notion, tho' not to be answer'd, and therefore hath pass'd it by, and considers another Reason, and says of this, "that 'tis very uncouth." But how doth that appear? Why Mr. H---t says, p. 36. "that according to my way of talking, Christ first pray'd to God to multiply the Loaves and Fishes, &c." To which he ought to have added my following Words, p. 161. or else he so blessed them himself, and increased them so miraculously by his Blessing, &c. and where's the Absurdity of it that I say so? Yes, Mr. H---t asks very notably, "where lay the multiply'd Loaves and Fishes all the while Christ was giving Thanks? Were they all laid in a large Heap?" I answer, that the Scriptures are silent upon this Head: But there doth not seem to be any thing odd in it, if I say, that all the Food, both Bread and Fish, was prepar'd before the Distribution, and most likely it is, that it was so: Because the Miracle by this Means became more conspicuous and magnificent. As to Christ's blessing the Bread and Wine, when he instituted his own Supper, I take it to be a very different thing from his miraculous blessing the Loaves and Fishes. The one was done by a Display of *Almighty Power*, the other by an *Exercise of Authority*, accompanied with *Prayers* and *Thanksgivings*. And 'tis plain to me that our Saviour did more than give Thanks; because two of the Evangelists, viz. St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, use both the Words Blessing, and giving Thanks, which I can't think they wou'd have done, unless they had, as I said p. 161. a distinct Signification when apply'd to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And that St. *Luke* doth not use both Words also (for 'tis evident St. *Paul* doth, 1 *Cor.* x. 16. xi. 24. compar'd) is not with any Design to shew that they have the same Signification when apply'd to the Sacrament; this is Mr. H---t's *Fancy*. But, as is common in other Cases, St. *Luke* mentions Thanksgiving as a Part, and as a *noble* and *considerable Part* for the Whole. 'Twas common among the Ancients, to call the Sacrament the *Eucharist*: But wou'd it not be odd to argue thence (contrary to their known and constant Practice) that Prayers were not used upon this solemn Occasion? 'Tis no less odd, I think, to talk only of Thanksgiving at the first Appointment of our Lord's Supper; and odder still to say, that Christ bless'd the Sacramental Elements no otherwise than by giving Thanks to God for his Creatures; and to add afterwards in these *remarkable Words*, p. 185. "That it would be very surprizing if any Set of Men shou'd now have any Power to bless them in any other Manner." What Meaning have Words, if this doth not come up to
what

what I say, and what Mr. *H---t* calls downright Falshood? Mr. *H---t* is come to say now, *p.* 37. " that Christ no " doubt did other Things, and that he did not say, that " Christ did nothing else but bless the Creatures." Or which is the same with him, bless God for the Creatures. But I ask, whether Christ is said to do any thing but what is meant by the Words Blessing and giving Thanks, which Mr. *H---t* takes to be the same, except break the Bread, take the Cup, declare their Signification, and order the Distribution of the Elements? As therefore, according to Mr. *H---t*, no more is meant by blessing the Bread than giving Thanks to God for his Creatures, and Ministers now have no Power to bless them in any other Manner, what have they to do at the Sacrament, but to render Thanks to God for his Creatures? unless Mr. *H---t* will weakly add what is nothing to the Argument, that they must also break the Bread, take the Cup, and distribute the Elements. And then, what have Christians to do, but to join with their Ministers in giving Thanks to God for his Creatures, and afterwards receive them? If Mr. *H---t* had other Meanings, that I cou'd not know, his Words are plain. If he doth not differ from other *Protestants* about the serious and spiritual Duties that we are to perform, so much the better: But even his Notion of giving Thanks as applied to the Lord's Supper is very odd, and is less than is required at our own ordinary and common Meals. There is mention made, I allow, of giving Thanks at the Lord's Supper: But 'tis Mr. *H---t*, and not the Scripture that says, that this was no otherwise done than by giving Thanks to God for his Creatures. This is much too *flat* and *mean*, when applied to the Lord's Supper, and can't but have a very ill Tendency, unless guarded with *good Meanings*. It must tend to make this Feast (as I said) a *very Trifle*. And therefore, I think, it was *my Duty*, and not (according to Mr. *H---t*'s unaccountable way of talking) a heinous Wickedness, to speak against Notions that must appear very loose and dangerous without Additions and good Explications. It cou'd help the Matter very little, that Mr. *H---t* says all Prayers shou'd be confin'd to the Lord's Supper. This may serve to shew, that Mr. *H---t* can talk inconsistently as well as others, and forget in one Page what he had writ in another; but what Service cou'd such an *idle Fancy* do to take off the Offensiveness of what Mr. *H---t* says?

Mr. *H---t* says, *p.* 37. " I indecently call giving the Lord's-Supper to Infants a *ridiculous Custom*:" But this, I think, was very soft: For I might as well have called it a
wicked

wicked Custom: Because a Prostitution of one of the great Solemnities of our holy Religion: And what if it did obtain in *Cyprian's* Time? This won't shew, that 'tis not an Error, but only, that the Error is *ancient*. I am apt to think with most modern Divines, that this Custom was brought into the Church through mistaken Apprehensions of *John* vi. 53. And that it is a great Fault, that it is not thrown out of all Churches. The *Reformed Churches* (on which Mr. *H---t* is pleased to bestow *this Compliment*, that they came out of *Rome*) have rejected the Custom with Scorn, and I hope will never take it up again. The Notion, I think, ought to be received, (as Mr. *P---ce* says, *Preface*, p. 4. it was by ingenious Persons to whom he suggested it, except one or two, who had the Hint from him, meaning, I suppose, Mr. *H---t* for one) with *Contempt*, *Horror*, and *Detestation*. And whilst it hath, and is likely to have such a just Reception, there can't be, that I see, any great Occasion to write against it.

Mr. *H---t* says, p. 38. " I am never weary of uttering my Falshoods." I wish for his own sake more than my own, that he was once weary of uttering his *groundless ill Language*. But what is my Falshood? Why Mr. *H---t* says, " he spake only of one Duty, viz. Prayer in the Company of Unbelievers." Whereas I say, that Mr. *H---t* represents St. *Paul* as if he did not, and speaks of Christians as if they ought not to mention the Name of Christ when they perform any Duty in the Presence and Company of Unbelievers. But Mr. *H---t*, who is so very sharp, shou'd have consider'd, that it was about Prayer and Thanksgiving (which he himself speaks of, p. 186.) that I was speaking; and that accordingly I said in the next Page, and same Discourse, that St. *Paul's* Worship cou'd not have been acceptable without it. And what Right then hath Mr. *H---t* (when I was only speaking of Worship, and particularly of the Duties of Prayer and Thanksgiving) to apply it to any other, and first to make me impertinent without Cause, that he might be the better able afterwards to charge me with Falshood? The *any Duty* that I mention, can't, in any reasonable Construction, have Reference to any Duties but these of *Prayer* and *Thanksgiving*, of which there are various Kinds. 'Tis pretty plain from what Mr. *H---t* says of Worship, and particularly of Prayer and Thanksgiving afterwards, that he did then understand me. I leave him therefore to account to his own Conscience for the Injustice of his Charge, and proceed. Says Mr. *H---t*, " I lay it down for a certain Truth, that St. *Paul* wou'd not
" speak

“ speak a Lye to God in his Thanksgiving.” Very right, I think so too. But says Mr. *H---t*, “ if all in the Ship were Unbelievers besides himself, it wou’d have been a Lye, if he had said, We offer Thanks in the Name of Christ; or we ask for Christ’s Sake.” Very right still. But where doth Mr. *H---t* find, that St. *Paul* did thus word his Prayers or Thanksgivings in the *Plural Number*? ’Tis possible, he might, because there were more Prisoners in the Ship, and perhaps, some of them might be Christians: But all that is said in the History is; that after St. *Paul* had advised them to take Bread, *he took Bread himself, and gave Thanks to God in the Presence of them all, and when he had broken it, he began to eat.* And then it follows, *that they were all of good cheer, and they also took some Meat,* Acts xxvii. 34, 35, 36. Here is no Intimation of *Joint-Worship*. And I have so good an Opinion of St. *Paul*, as to think, that like a good and brave Soldier of Jesus Christ, he kept on in his *old honest Christian Way* of offering up his Prayers and Thanksgivings openly in the Name of Christ, and did not *mumble* them *inwardly* in his own Mind (according to Mr. *H---t*’s way of talking) “ I ask for Jesus Sake, or to that Purpose, p. 38, 39.” This wou’d have been sneaking or time-serving with a witness, whatever Mr. *H---t* says. But says Mr. *H---t*, “ ’tis impossible in the Nature of Things, that Unbelievers or wicked Men shou’d join in *Christian Prayers*.” But must honest Christians then baulk their Duty in complaisance to them? What if all in a *Family* can’t say with Truth, *Father thy Kingdom come*, must Family Duties be dropp’d upon their Account? What if all in a *Congregation* can’t say with any Truth, *Forgive us our Trespases as we forgive them that trespass against us*, must we therefore shut up our Churches, or forbear this or the like excellent Petitions? I think, we ought not to keep upon the *Reserve*, and *curtail* our Prayers, or throw Christ out of them, to oblige either *Jews*, or *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, or *Deists*, or other *erroneous*, or *wicked Men*. The Case is plain, we must worship Christ, and worship in his Name, let who will be present, and our Worship can’t be acceptable without it. And whereas, Mr. *H---t* pretends, “ that all the Prayers of the Church shou’d be confin’d to the Lord’s Supper, and that none, if grown up, shou’d be admitted to them, but those that are qualified by Faith in Christ, and an holy Life; and that this was the Method in the first Ages, &c.” I answer, this wou’d be to put our Congregations into a dismal Case: For at this rate, if any are bad, they must never have the Advantage of *publick*

lick Prayers, but perhaps, in this respect, live *Prayerless* throughout the greatest Part of their lives : *Monstrous Barbarity!* What cou'd poor Sinners do, if there were not some, who had more Compassion, than the *Papists*, who will allow them none in *publick* but *Latin Prayers*, which few perhaps of them understand, or than Mr. *H---t*, who will allow them *none at all*? Whatever Mr. *H---t* says of my Knowledge of the *Fathers*, p. 39. thus much I know of them, that *his* was not the *Primitive Method*. Many of them did not enter upon what they call'd their *Treatises* or *Sermons* without Prayer to God first premised. We have the very Prayers preserved that some of them used before their Sermons. This was *Cyprian's* usual if not constant Method to begin with Prayer. And if we come so low as *Austin's* Time, his Opinion was, that no one ought to preach before he pray. And as to those who did not begin their *Treatises* or *Sermons* with Prayer, yet they with all the Congregation joined in Prayer, as soon as the *Treatise* was over; nor was it till after the Prayers were over, and all dismissed besides the Communicants, that they began to receive the Lord's Supper. Mr. *H---t* therefore shou'd be a little more modest as to Things he is unacquainted with, and not speak of Things as true that will best suit his Notions, but have no Foundation.

Mr. *H---t* hath nothing to answer to what I say, *viz.* That we are under the same Obligations to say Grace after Meat, as before, only he says, after a little *Banter* upon the *Scots*, which might better be spared, that he dares not make more Duties than God hath made; nor is it my Desire that he or any one shou'd; but then, I wou'd not have him throw aside Duties that God hath enjoined, or put any groundless *Fancies* into Person's Heads that are too likely to be a Temptation to them to do it.

Mr. *H---t*, except in one or two Things is so very trifling in his four last Pages in answer to the Remarks I made upon his eleventh Discourse, that I have need only to desire my Readers to compare his Answer and my Remarks together, by which, I persuade myself, they must be satisfied, that he is forced to give up that Discourse, as not being able, I suppose, to defend his own Positions and Notions therein, *viz.* "That Heaven never once in all the Bible signifies the Place in which good Men shall dwell after the Judgment-Day. That we have nothing to expect after the Day of Judgment, but an earthly Paradise." These Things I have largely confuted in my *Preservative*, from Page 77 to Page 92. And what doth Mr. *H---t* say to

to all this? Why, that what he hath said, doth not contradict what St. *John* hath said, and how can this chuse but be true, (tho' the contrary be irrefragably proved) when Mr. *H---t* says, that it is so? Farther, Mr. *H---t* finds fault with the Sense I give of 2 *Cor.* v. 1, 2. but the Apostle's Words are very plain, and signify, what I say they do, p. 181, 182. Tho' the Apostle doth not express himself *adverbially*, there was no Occasion that he shou'd, and Mr. *H---t* is forced to add to the Apostle's Words to bring them to his Sense, which *surprizing Liberty*, if allowable, we may make the Scriptures speak what we please. Farther, Mr. *H---t* says, p. 40. "I pass over your silly Banter, p. 182. because it falls upon St. *John*, and he is above needing my help to defend him." This last is very true; but I shew, p. 183. that Mr. *H---t*, by his Interpretation of what St. *John* says, hath exposed him to the *Banter* and *Contempt* of *Infidels*: And therefore, tho' there was no Occasion to defend St. *John*, yet there was Occasion to defend himself. In answer to what I offer from 2 *Pet.* iii. 13. Mr. *H---t* says, "he hath demonstrated the contrary to what I say to some Friend's Satisfaction." But who that Friend is, I can't tell. And what his Demonstration is, it seems, I am not to know, but must wait till it be published, which, 'tis possible, it never may. This is one of Mr. *H---t*'s notable ways of answering Arguments. If I call somewhat that Mr. *H---t* says a *part* and *bold Addition*, it was not without Cause. But Mr. *H---t* says, "'twas neither pert nor bold" to add the Apostle's Words to our Saviour's." This is undoubtedly right: But tho' Mr. *H---t* says, p. 41. they are St. *John*'s own Words, I can't find that St. *John* hath any such Words; that the Kingdom that is now in Heaven, will hereafter come down out of Heaven. And this shews, what sad Extremities Mr. *H---t* is reduced to, when he is forced to make St. *Paul* and St. *John* also, to say what they never do to support his Notions: But if Notions can't be defended but by such a Method, 'tis a thousand times more honourable to give them up. I have largely proved, p. 183, 191, 192. and so on to the End of my *Preservative*, that St. *John* hath not given us a literal Description of the place where good Men are to have their future Residence; and what doth Mr. *H---t* say? Why he refers me back to the Book I had been answering, which is a very *fine* and *easy Way* of answering: But after this rate, 'tis impossible to say any thing but Mr. *H---t* may answer, for by referring me to what he hath said, the Work is done.

H

I have

I have a Word or two to add to two Paragraphs more, in one of which, *p. 39.* Mr. *H---t* says, according to his common way of talking, " That I have as wickedly represented his eleventh Discourse as any of the rest ; " but I assure Mr. *H---t*, I am not conscious of any wicked Representation of any thing he hath said, and, I think, I have made it abundantly clear that I have not. He says farther, " The known wilful Falshood that runs through my whole Discourse on this Head is, that I speak of him as teaching Persons to carry their Views and Expectations no higher than an *earthly Paradise*, and carnal sensual Delights. " Now, as to that part about an *earthly Paradise*, Mr. *H---t* knows, and so must all that have read his Book, that 'tis strictly true. And though the Words *carnal* and *sensual Delights* are very often taken in an ill Sense, and signify forbidden Delights, yet it is plain, I did not intend such Delights, but such as *Adam*, whilst innocent, had in *Paradise*, which in *p. 176.* where my Meaning is fully express'd, I more properly call *sensible*, and let what I have offered there be fairly considered ; and all, I believe, must be convinced, that I have not in the least misrepresented Mr. *H---t* ; and that whatever he says now, it was a very mean Representation that he gives us of the State and Place of good Men after the Resurrection.

The last Paragraph I have to consider begins *p. 41.* where, says Mr. *H---t*, " That you might not seem to come short of the envied Mr. *P---ce* in any part of Knowledge, you have ventured to try your Skill at Mathematicks. " I had no Eye to Mr. *P---ce*, (whose Skill in Mathematicks, as I have been told, was inconsiderable) or yet to magnify myself in the little I said upon this Subject : But as my Argument led me to consider the Dimensions of the new *Jerusalem* of *St. John*, so I gave it as my Conjecture, (for the Scripture hath determined nothing in the Case) that twelve thousand Furlongs contain the *Area* of the whole City. And then added the Passage Mr. *H---t* repeats. Mr. *H---t* must needs think, that I knew very well, that *Area* and *Square* were *synonymous Terms*, and that therefore I could never be guilty of such an intolerable Blunder, as to say that twelve thousand and a hundred and nine were the same ; and therefore the least Candor would have led any one to think, that there must be some accidental Omission. As soon as I saw this, (for I was in the West when 'twas published) I was surpriz'd, that I had left out the Word *Root* in these two Places that Mr. *H---t* is so brisk upon.

But

But the Book was gone Abroad, and 'twas too late to rectify the Mistake. And it shews what an Adversary I have to deal with, that will so greedily catch at a *bare casual Advantage*, and aggravate it as Mr. H---t hath done. If instead of saying the *Square* of it being a hundred and nine Furlongs, I had said, as I knew very well I ought, the *Square-Root* of it was a hundred and nine Furlongs, it had been true, omitting a small *Fraction*. And so, if instead of saying, the *Square* of *Old Babylon*, according to *Herodotus*, was a hundred and twenty, I had said the *Square-Root* of it was a hundred and twenty, this had been strictly true without any *Fraction* at all. And therefore if my Conjecture was right, that twelve thousand Furlongs contain the *Area* of the *New Jerusalem*, as fourteen thousand four hundred Furlongs contain the *Area* of *Old Babylon*, my Inference must be just, viz. that the *Squares* and *Square-Roots* of *New Jerusalem* and *Old Babylon* being so much disproportioned, the *New Jerusalem* must by Consequence be less than *Old Babylon*. But after all, whatever St. *John* means by his twelve thousand Furlongs, and his hundred and forty four Cubits in the next Verse, I have said enough besides to shew, that he can't be understood in a *literal Sense*. And what I have said here shews, that I can expect no Mercy, tho' only an *accidental Mistake* (for 'twas no more) drop from me. Mr. H---t, by taking so much Advantage of an *Omission*, when he must needs see what was intended, and that the Mistake could not proceed from Ignorance, (if he knows any thing of what he hath writ about) must do himself a great deal more Prejudice with all *learned* and *candid Persons* than he can me.

But 'tis full time to shut up, and to beg the Reader's Pardon, that I han't been able to entertain him to greater Advantage, which I should have been very glad to do, if Mr. H---t had given me any fair Occasion; but 'tis so little that he says to the chief things in my *Preservative*, that I must have gone much farther from the strictness of an Answer than I have, to give him the Satisfaction I cou'd wish. I have gone farther into some things than I had need, that I might be a little more useful, than a close and concise Answer wou'd have suffered me to be. I'll trust the Candor of the World with the *Vindication* I have made of my *Character* from the many *black* and *heavy Charges* Mr. H---t hath thought fit to advance against me. I had no need to say so much; but I have *this once* paid what Mr. H---t calls his Answer more Respect than most, I presume, will think
it

it deserves: And wish, that what I have said may dispose him to that Christian Temper that I recommend in the Words that he is pleased to quote from my *Coronation Sermon*. I hope, whatever Mr. H---t says, I never shewed my self to be of another Temper; but if I have, it is my Fault, and what I'll condemn myself for. I can be sure, that it is a Temper that I like very much, and I should be glad to see it for the future in others, though I am forced to say, I have met with little of it in any, whom *Conference* and a regard to *Truth*, and not *delight in Controversy* hath led me to oppose.

F I N I S

6 JU 65

ERRATA.

Page 8. Line 9. for Low read Low.

p. 11. l. 1. for alas. r.

p. 12. l. 23. for

p. 27. l. 23. for

p. 26. l. 23. for

